arXiv:1409.1659v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 19 Dec 2014

$\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry-protected topological phases in the SU(3) AKLT model

Takahiro Morimoto,[1] Hiroshi Ueda,[1] Tsutomu Momoi,[1,2] and Akira Furusaki[1,2]

[1] *Condensed Matter Theory Laboratory, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan*
[2] *RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science (CEMS), Wako, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan*

(Dated: December 22, 2014)

We study $\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry-protected topological (SPT) phases in one-dimensional spin systems with $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry. We construct ground-state wave functions of the matrix product form for nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_3$ phases and their parent Hamiltonian from a cocycle of the group cohomology $H^2(Z_3 \times Z_3, U(1))$. The Hamiltonian is an SU(3) version of the Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) model, consisting of bilinear and biquadratic terms of su(3) generators in the adjoint representation. A generalization to the SU(N) case, the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian, is also presented which realizes nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_N$ SPT phases. We use the infinite-size variant of the density matrix renormalization group (iDMRG) method to determine the ground-state phase diagram of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model as a function of the parameter θ controlling the ratio of the bilinear and biquadratic coupling constants. The nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase is found for a range of the parameter θ including the point of vanishing biquadratic term ($\theta = 0$) as well as the SU(3) AKLT point [$\theta = \arctan(2/9)$]. A continuous phase transition to the SU(3) dimer phase takes place at $\theta \approx -0.027\pi$, with a central charge $c \approx 3.2$. For SU(3) symmetric cases we define string order parameters for the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases in a similar way to the conventional Haldane phase. We propose simple spin models that effectively realize the SU(3) and SU(4) AKLT models.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Haldane phase[1,2] of antiferromagnetic $S = 1$ spin chains is a representative topological phase of one-dimensional (1D) gapped quantum systems. In the Haldane phase, excitations are gapped in the bulk, while zero-energy states of effective $S = 1/2$ spins are present at the boundaries. The essence of the Haldane phase is captured by the toy model proposed by Affleck, Kennedy, Lieb, and Tasaki (AKLT),[3,4] which is constructed from projection operators acting on two neighboring sites. Its ground state (the AKLT state) has the following structure. Each $S = 1$ spin is decomposed into two virtual $S = 1/2$ spins. On each site two $S = 1/2$ spins are symmetrized to form an $S = 1$ spin, while two $S = 1/2$ spins from neighboring sites form a singlet on each bond. At each end of the spin chain, an effective $S = 1/2$ spin is left without forming a singlet and realizes two-fold degenerate zero modes. The AKLT state shows no apparent symmetry breaking such as magnetic order and lattice symmetry breaking. However, it has a hidden order called the string order,[5] which corresponds to a ferromagnetic order in the system after a non-local unitary transformation.[6,7] The string order signals a hidden $Z_2 \times Z_2$ symmetry breaking in the Haldane phase.

Recent advances in the understanding of 1D topological phases are brought by the notion of symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases.[8–12] The Haldane phase is an SPT phase that is protected by any one of the following symmetries:[9] (a) time-reversal symmetry, (b) link inversion symmetry, and (c) the dihedral group of π rotations about the S_x, S_y, and S_z axes. Here let us assume the $Z_2 \times Z_2$ symmetry of the dihedral group. The AKLT Hamiltonian is invariant under the π rotation around the S_x and S_z axes, and these π rotations commute with each other for the original $S = 1$ spins. However, they do not commute (in fact anticommute) with each other for the virtual $S = 1/2$ spins. This is an example of projective representations of symmetry groups, i.e., symmetry operations represented projectively on the effective (fractionalized) degrees of freedom which appear at the boundaries. This can be nicely formulated in the framework of matrix product states (MPSs) for 1D gapped systems. The AKLT wave function is written in the MPS form with 2×2 matrices acting on the two states $|\uparrow\rangle$, $|\downarrow\rangle$ of a virtual $S = 1/2$ spin. Symmetry operations (π rotations) acting on the three states of each $S = 1$ spin induce linear transformations of the 2×2 matrices, which are then expressed as unitary transformations in the two-dimensional space spanned by $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$. The unitary matrices of this basis transformation give a projective representation of the symmetry group with a phase factor which is an element of the group cohomology $H^2(Z_2 \times Z_2, U(1))$. The Haldane phase is an example of SPT phases and corresponds to the nontrivial element of $H^2(Z_2 \times Z_2, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. In general 1D SPT phases protected by symmetry group G are classified in terms of the second cohomology group $H^2(G, U(1))$ of the group G.[10–13]

In this paper we generalize the AKLT state of the Haldane phase to 1D SPT phases protected by $Z_N \times Z_N$ symmetry. We focus on the case of $N = 3$ and briefly discuss the general case $N > 3$. Our starting point is the observation that $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry can be projectively represented by 3×3 matrices, with a U(1) phase factor which is a nontrivial element of $H^2(Z_3 \times Z_3, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_3$. This observation allows us to write down MPS wave functions with 3×3 matrices as described below, as a natural generalization of the AKLT state. The MPS wave functions are ground states of an SU(3) generalization of the AKLT model and describe topological states in $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases.

We construct the SU(3) AKLT states on a 1D lattice where the local Hilbert space on each site is spanned by eight states of the adjoint representation **8** of su(3), which we call meson states. The eight meson states are represented by traceless bilinear forms of two sets of three virtual degrees of freedom, i.e., three quarks (u, d, s) in the fundamental representation **3** and three antiquarks $(\bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s})$ in the conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$. The SU(3) AKLT states are valence bond solids in which a quark and an antiquark on neighboring sites form a singlet state on the bond connecting the two sites, whereas a quark and an antiquark on the same site form a meson state. When the 1D chain has ends, three-fold degenerate boundary zeromodes appear at each end, which are either unpaired quark or antiquark states. The possibility of having two types (quark or antiquark) of zeromodes indicates that there are two distinct types of SU(3) AKLT states, each of which represents a distinct $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase. Both SU(3) AKLT states are ground states of the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian which consists of bilinear and biquadratic terms of su(3) generators in the **8** representation with a particular ratio of the two terms. The SU(3) Hamiltonian and its ground-state wave functions were in fact presented earlier in Refs. 14–16. In this paper we characterize the SU(3) AKLT states as $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT states in the classification in terms of group cohomology $H^2(Z_3 \times Z_3, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_3$ and report results of detailed study on their correlation functions and a quantum phase transition to a dimerized phase. We note that Refs. 17 and 18 studied PSU(3) symmetric spin chains which realize $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases corresponding to nontrivial elements of $H^3(\mathrm{PSU(3)},\mathrm{U(1)}) = \mathbb{Z}_3$. The SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian can also be considered as a PSU(3) symmetric model realizing $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases protected by PSU(3) symmetry in that the adjoint representation of SU(3) is also a representation of PSU(3).

We can further generalize the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian to the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian ($N > 3$) consisting of bilinear and biquadratic terms of the su(N) generators in the adjoint representation $\boldsymbol{N^2 - 1}$. Its two-fold degenerate ground state (under periodic boundary conditions) is given by SU(N) AKLT states which are MPSs with $N \times N$ matrices. The SU(N) AKLT states are valence bond solids in which states in the $\boldsymbol{N^2 - 1}$ representation are decomposed into products of states from $\boldsymbol{N}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$ representations, which form $\boldsymbol{N^2 - 1}$ and singlet states on each site and bond, respectively. The SU(N) AKLT model has an energy gap as its two-point correlation functions of SU(N) operators are short-ranged with a correlation length being equal to $\xi_N = 1/\ln(N^2 - 1)$. Realizations of SPT phases with SU(N) symmetry in other representations are proposed in the context of cold atoms.[19]

As in the SU(2) AKLT state, the SU(N) AKLT states have a hidden long-range order. To see this for the SU(3) AKLT model, we define string order parameters that characterize the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase by making use of the system's full SU(3) symmetry. Similar to the conventional string order parameter for the SU(2) AKLT state which indicates the antiferromagnetic order upon neglecting $S_z = 0$ states, the string order parameters for the SU(3) AKLT states have string operators from SU(3) operators (analogous to the S_z operator) which count the number of constituent quarks or antiquarks. We show the long-range order of string correlations by explicitly calculating string order parameters in the SU(3) AKLT states. Incidentally, the string orders that we define are different from those studied in Refs. 17, 18, and 20 where only $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry is assumed.

As the ratio of the two coupling constants in the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian is varied, a quantum phase transition occurs from a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase to a topologically trivial dimer phase which breaks translation symmetry. We study this topological phase transition using the infinite-size variant of the density matrix renormalization group (iDMRG) method.[21–23] We obtain the phase diagram of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model and determine the location of the critical point numerically. We find that the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase occupies a finite region in the parameter space and survives even when the biquadratic term is absent. From scaling of entanglement entropy we obtain numerical evidence that the critical point is described by the level-2 SU(3) Wess-Zumino-Witten theory.

Finally, we demonstrate that the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian is realized by an $S = 1$ spin chain with staggered quadrupole couplings in the strong-coupling limit. Using the fact that spin dipole and quadrupole operators of $S = 1$ spins together form eight generators of su(3) in the fundamental representation **3**, we construct Hamiltonians with staggered nearest-neighbor couplings of quadrupole operators whose ground states are smoothly connected to the SU(3) AKLT states in the limit where positive quadrupole couplings are very strong. In a similar manner, we propose that the SU(4) AKLT Hamiltonian is effectively realized in the strong-coupling limit of an $S = 1/2$ spin-orbital model which is a variant of the Kugel-Khomskii model.[24]

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we review the MPS representation of gapped 1D quantum systems and the classification of 1D SPT phases in terms of group cohomology. In Sec. III we construct the SU(3) AKLT model from a nontrivial cocycle of $H^2(Z_3 \times Z_3, U(1))$ and discuss its generalization to SU(N). In Sec. IV we define string order parameters that characterize nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases for the SU(3) symmetric case. In Sec. V we study the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model with the iDMRG method and show its ground-state phase diagram. In Sec. VI, we present realizations of the SU(3) and SU(4) AKLT Hamiltonians in an $S = 1$ spin chain and an $S = 1/2$ spin-orbital model. In Sec. VII we give a brief summary.

II. MATRIX PRODUCT STATES AND GROUP COHOMOLOGY

In this section, we give a brief review on the classification of the 1D SPT phases in terms of the group cohomology[10–13] and its application to the AKLT model for the Haldane phase. This will serve as a basis for the generalization of the AKLT model to the SU(3) case in the next section.

A. Matrix product state

We consider a gapped ground state of an infinite spin chain described by a wave function $|\Psi\rangle$, which we assume to be translation invariant. Let us consider bipartitioning of the chain between the site n and the site $n+1$. Then we decompose the wave function

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i w_i |\psi_n^L\rangle_i |\psi_{n+1}^R\rangle_i, \tag{1}$$

where w_i's are singular values, and $|\psi_n^L\rangle_i$ and $|\psi_{n+1}^R\rangle_i$ are wave functions on the left and the right semi-infinite chains that form orthonormal basis for the left and right Hilbert spaces. Alternatively we can decompose the wave function between the site $n+1$ and the site $n+2$:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i w_i |\psi_{n+1}^L\rangle_i |\psi_{n+2}^R\rangle_i, \tag{2}$$

where the set of singular values are the same as in Eq. (1) because of the translation symmetry. Now we write $|\psi_{n+1}^L\rangle_i$ in terms of $|\psi_n^L\rangle_i$ and local states $|m\rangle$ at the site $n+1$ as

$$|\psi_{n+1}^L\rangle_j = \sum_m A_{ij}^m |\psi_n^L\rangle_i \otimes |m\rangle, \tag{3}$$

where A^m is a matrix defined for each local state $|m\rangle$ and is independent of the site n where we cut the spin chain, again due to the translation symmetry.

If we repeat this procedure, we can relate any two left singular vectors $|\psi_n^L\rangle_j$ and $|\psi_{n'}^L\rangle_j$ with $n < n'$ as

$$|\psi_{n'}^L\rangle_{i_{n'}} = \sum_{i_n,\dots,i_{n'-1}} \sum_{m_{n+1},\dots,m_{n'}} A_{i_n i_{n+1}}^{m_{n+1}} \cdots A_{i_{n'-1} i_{n'}}^{m_{n'}} \times |\psi_n^L\rangle_{i_n} \otimes |m_{n+1} \dots m_{n'}\rangle. \tag{4}$$

The reduced density matrix for the finite region $(n+1,\dots,n')$ and physical quantities derived from it can be obtained from the above equation relating singular vectors. If we extend this procedure to a periodic chain of length L, then we obtain the MPS form of the ground-state wave function,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\{m_i\}} \mathrm{tr}[A^{m_1} A^{m_2} \dots A^{m_L}]\, |m_1 \dots m_L\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where the trace is over the product of matrices A^m.

B. Symmetry operation and MPS

Let us suppose that the system of our interest has a symmetry group G and its ground-state wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ is invariant under global action of any element in G. We assume that the symmetry action is local (e.g., on-site) and unitary. Local states are transformed by action of $g \in G$ as

$$|m\rangle \to \sum_n g_{nm} |n\rangle \tag{6}$$

with a unitary matrix g_{nm}. The wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ is written in the form of an MPS of Eq. (5), whose transformation by g is obtained by applying Eq. (6) to the local states $|m\rangle$ at every site:

$$|\Psi\rangle \to |\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle = \sum_{\{m_i,n_i\}} \mathrm{tr}[g_{n_1 m_1} A^{m_1} \dots g_{n_L m_L} A^{m_L}] |n_1 \dots n_L\rangle. \tag{7}$$

We see that the wave function $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ is an MPS made from the matrices

$$\widetilde{A}^m = \sum_n g_{mn} A^n. \tag{8}$$

We demand that the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ be invariant up to a phase factor, i.e., $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle = e^{iL\theta_g} |\Psi\rangle$. This is achieved if

$$\sum_n g_{mn} A^n = e^{i\theta_g} U_g^{-1} A^m U_g, \tag{9}$$

where U_g is a g-dependent unitary matrix which is independent of the local states m. It is known that U_g is unique up to a $U(1)$ phase when the transfer matrix $\sum_m A^m \otimes (A^m)^*$ has only one eigenvalue of the largest magnitude[10,25] (the state is not a macroscopic superposition of orthogonal states).

Let us consider successive actions of $g, h \in G$ on $|\Psi\rangle$, which induce transformations

$$\sum_{l,n} g_{ml} h_{ln} A^n = e^{i\theta_g} e^{i\theta_h} U_h^{-1} U_g^{-1} A^m U_g U_h, \tag{10}$$

where we have used the fact that G is a unitary symmetry (which does not include an anti-unitary operator such as time reversal), as we assume throughout this paper. Equation (10) should coincide with the transformation induced by an action of gh,

$$\sum_n (gh)_{mn} A^n = e^{i\theta_{gh}} U_{gh}^{-1} A^m U_{gh}. \tag{11}$$

We thus have

$$\theta_{gh} = \theta_g + \theta_h, \tag{12a}$$

$$U_g U_h = \exp[i\phi(g,h)] U_{gh}, \tag{12b}$$

where the second equation has a U(1) phase. Equation (12b) shows that U_g's give a projective representation of the symmetry group G. The phase function $\phi(g,h)$ encodes topological data of the ground-state wave function and has the following two properties [Eqs. (14) and (16)] that define group cohomology.

Cocycle: Let us calculate the product $U_{g_1}U_{g_2}U_{g_3}$ in two different ways (associativity):

$$\begin{aligned} U_{g_1}U_{g_2}U_{g_3} &= \exp[i\phi(g_2,g_3)]U_{g_1}U_{g_2g_3} \\ &= \exp[i\phi(g_2,g_3)+i\phi(g_1,g_2g_3)]U_{g_1g_2g_3} \end{aligned} \tag{13a}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} U_{g_1}U_{g_2}U_{g_3} &= \exp[i\phi(g_1,g_2)]U_{g_1g_2}U_{g_3} \\ &= \exp[i\phi(g_1,g_2)+i\phi(g_1g_2,g_3)]U_{g_1g_2g_3}. \end{aligned} \tag{13b}$$

The consistency between the two results requires the phase function to satisfy

$$\phi(g_2,g_3)-\phi(g_1g_2,g_3)+\phi(g_1,g_2g_3)-\phi(g_1,g_2)=0. \tag{14}$$

This is the cocycle condition. (For more mathematical details, see Appendix A.)

Coboundary: The ambiguity of a U(1) phase in defining a unitary matrix U_g in Eq. (9) implies that we are free to take another set of unitary matrices,

$$\widetilde{U}_g = \exp[i\beta(g)]U_g. \tag{15}$$

Accordingly, the phase function appearing in the projective representation in Eq. (12b) is changed from ϕ to $\tilde{\phi}$,

$$\tilde{\phi}(g_1,g_2)=\phi(g_1,g_2)+[\beta(g_2)-\beta(g_1g_2)+\beta(g_1)], \tag{16}$$

where the three terms in the square brackets [ ] are called 2-coboundary; see Appendix A. The two phase functions ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ are equivalent up to a 2-coboundary and describe the same topological phase.

The set of phase functions that satisfy the cocycle condition (14) is quotiented with the equivalence relation of Eq. (16). This equivalences class is an element of $H^2(G,U(1))$, the second cohomology group of the group cohomology of G over U(1). Apparently, when phase functions of two states belong to different elements of $H^2(G,U(1))$, we cannot adiabatically deform one state to the other while preserving the symmetry. Thus the cohomology group $H^2(G,U(1))$ classifies topological phases protected by symmetry group G.[10–12] The definition of group cohomology and a useful formula (Künneth formula) in the calculation of non-trivial cocycles are briefly summarized in Appendix A.

In an SPT phase characterized by a projective representation U_g of symmetry group G, the ground-state wave function possesses non-trivial boundary modes of which symmetry transformations become anomalous. To see this, we consider an MPS wave function on a finite chain of length L,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\{m_i\}} v^\dagger A^{m_1}A^{m_2}\dots A^{m_L}v'|m_1\dots m_L\rangle, \tag{17}$$

where v and v' are boundary vectors specifying boundary conditions at the end sites 1 and L. From Eq. (9), the action of an element g of symmetry group G transforms the MPS wave function as

$$g|\Psi\rangle = e^{iL\theta_g}\sum_{\{m_i\}} v^\dagger U_g^{-1}A^{m_1}A^{m_2}\dots A^{m_L}U_g v'|m_1\dots m_L\rangle. \tag{18}$$

Thus the boundary states determined by v and v' are transformed according to U_g. This indicates that the symmetry operations for effective boundary states are not given by the original action of g but by its projective representation U_g. In this sense the symmetry actions become anomalous at the boundaries.

C. Haldane phase and SU(2) AKLT model

The Haldane phase of $S=1$ antiferromagnetic spin chains is known as an example of an SPT phase with symmetry group $G=Z_2\times Z_2$.[8,9] Let us consider the AKLT model,[3,4] of which Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{\mathrm{AKLT}} = \sum_i \left[\boldsymbol{S}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}+\frac{1}{3}(\boldsymbol{S}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1})^2\right], \tag{19}$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ is a spin operator of $S=1$:

$$S^x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} & 1 & \\ 1 & & 1 \\ & 1 & \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20a}$$

$$S^y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} & -i & \\ i & & -i \\ & i & \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20b}$$

$$S^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{20c}$$

The AKLT Hamiltonian has SU(2) symmetry generated by the above three spin operators. In particular, they are invariant under its subgroup $Z_2\times Z_2$ generated by a π-rotation around the x-axis,

$$C_x = e^{i\pi S_x} = \begin{pmatrix} & & -1 \\ & -1 & \\ -1 & & \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

and a π-rotation around the z-axis,

$$C_z = e^{i\pi S_z} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

that commute with each other,

$$C_x C_z = C_z C_x. \tag{23}$$

The ground state of the AKLT Hamiltonian is best described in terms of the MPS in the following way. We first decompose every $S = 1$ spin into two $S = 1/2$ spins. Then the ground state is given as a valence-bond solid state of virtual $S = 1/2$ spins. Namely, the ground-state wave function is obtained by (i) projecting two $S = 1/2$ spins from two neighboring sites into a singlet state ($S = 0$) and (ii) projecting the $S = 1/2$ spins on each site into a triplet state ($S = 1$). This is expressed in the MPS with 2 by 2 matrices acting on the two-dimensional Hilbert space of a virtual $S = 1/2$ spin spanned by $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$. Two $S = 1/2$ spins forming an $S = 1$ spin on one site are coupled through three types of matrices which are the projection operators onto triplet states and labeled by the values of the total S^z:

$$\tilde{A}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{A}^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{A}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

Two $S = 1/2$ spins from neighboring sites are coupled by the matrix which is a projection operator to a singlet state,

$$\tilde{B} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

The ground-state wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ is then written in the MPS form,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\{m_i = 0, \pm 1\}} \mathrm{tr}\left[A^{m_1} A^{m_2} \dots A^{m_L}\right] |m_1 \dots m_L\rangle, \tag{26}$$

where the matrices $A^m = \tilde{A}^m \tilde{B}$ are given by

$$A^{\pm 1} = \frac{\pm\sigma_x + i\sigma_y}{2\sqrt{2}}, \qquad A^0 = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma_z \tag{27}$$

in terms of the Pauli matrices $\sigma_{x,y,z}$. This construction from projection operators is natural because the AKLT Hamiltonian in Eq. (19) consists of a product of Casimir operators of neighboring $S = 1$ spins that project $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{5} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{1}$ states onto $\mathbf{5}$ states such that the ground state is made of either $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{3}$ states of neighboring spins, i.e., two out of four $S = 1/2$ spins on two neighboring sites form a singlet.

Now let us discuss transformation of the MPS $|\Psi\rangle$ by operators from the $Z_2 \times Z_2$ symmetry group, i.e., C_x, C_z, and $C_x C_z$. We can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n (C_x)_{mn} A^n &= \sigma_x A^m \sigma_x, \\ \sum_n (C_z)_{mn} A^n &= \sigma_z A^m \sigma_z, \\ \sum_n (C_x C_z)_{mn} A^n &= \sigma_y A^m \sigma_y. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Comparing these equations with Eq. (9), we find a projective representation of the symmetry group

$$(U_{C_x}, U_{C_z}, U_{C_x C_z}) = (\sigma_x, \sigma_z, i\sigma_y), \tag{29}$$

and the associated phase function,

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi(C_x, C_z) = \pi, \quad \phi(C_z, C_x C_z) = 0, \quad \phi(C_x C_z, C_x) = 0, \\ &\phi(C_z, C_x) = 0, \quad \phi(C_x C_z, C_z) = \pi, \quad \phi(C_x, C_x C_z) = \pi, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

which is a 2-cocycle corresponding to a nontrivial element φ of $H^2(Z_2 \times Z_2, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ given in Appendix B [Eq. (B11)]. We note that commuting operations C_x and C_z are represented projectively, and their projective representations σ_x and σ_z anticommute with each other.

III. $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT PHASE AND SU(3) AKLT MODEL

In this section we study 1D SPT phases which are protected by global $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry and characterized by a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ topological number. They are natural generalizations of the Haldane phase with $Z_2 \times Z_2$ symmetry discussed in the previous section.[17,18,20] We show that $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases are realized in an SU(3) extension of the AKLT model.[14,15]

A. Group cohomology of $G = Z_3 \times Z_3$

Here we present a projective representation U_g for the symmetry group $G = Z_N \times Z_N$, summarizing the results from Appendix B.

The group elements of G are given by Eq. (B10), and its second cohomology group is $H^2(G, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_N$, generated by a 2-cocycle φ shown in Eq. (B11). A projective representation of G with the phase function $\phi = \varphi$ is generated by $N \times N$ matrices

$$U_x = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \qquad U_y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & \omega_N & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \omega_N^{N-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

which satisfy the algebra

$$U_x^N = U_y^N = 1_N, \qquad U_x U_y = \omega_N U_y U_x \tag{32a}$$

with

$$\omega_N = e^{2\pi i/N}. \tag{32b}$$

In the case of our main interest, $N = 3$, the projective representation is given by 3×3 matrices,

$$U_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad U_y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

where $\omega = \omega_3 = \exp(2\pi i/3)$. We thus expect a ground-state wave function of a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase to have the MPS form of 3×3 matrices which are subject to symmetry transformations generated by U_x and U_y in Eq. (33). We will demonstrate this below.

B. SU(3) AKLT model

In this section we show that an SPT phase protected by global $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry is realized in an SU(3) extension of the AKLT model. We begin with a brief review on representations of the Lie algebra su(3).[26] In this paper, the three basis states of the fundamental representation **3** of su(3) are denoted by three quarks u, d, s. Similarly, its conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ is spanned by antiquarks $\bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}$. We write the eight generators of su(3) in each representation as T^a $(a = 1, \ldots, 8)$. For the fundamental representation, the su(3) generators are given by

$$T^a = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_a, \tag{34}$$

where λ_a's are the Gell-Mann matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda_7 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

For the conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$, the su(3) generators are given by

$$T^a = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda_a^*. \tag{36}$$

Cartan subalgebra of su(3) consists of T^3 and T^8 that allow us to define weight vectors. The weight diagrams of the fundamental representation **3** and its conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ are shown in the T^3-T^8 plane in Fig. 1. The raising and lowering operators defined by

$$I^{\pm} \equiv T^1 \pm iT^2, \quad U^{\pm} \equiv T^6 \pm iT^7, \quad V^{\pm} \equiv T^4 \pm iT^5, \tag{37}$$

are also indicated for the fundamental representation **3** in Fig. 1.

The SU(3) extension of the AKLT state is obtained as follows. We assume that both **3** representation (u, d, s) and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ representation ($\bar{u}$, $\bar{d}$, $\bar{s}$) are placed on each site. From their tensor product,

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} = \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{1}, \tag{38}$$

we keep the octet representation **8** on each site. This is analogous to keeping an on-site triplet in the SU(2) case. For each pair of neighboring sites, we combine **3** from one site and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ from the other and project them onto singlet **1**, again similarly to the SU(2) case. At each end of a finite open chain, we have unpaired **3** or $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states, which form a triplet zero-energy boundary mode. Figure 2 shows schematic pictures of the SU(3) AKLT states. We note that there are two ways of constructing such states; see Fig. 2(a) and (b).[15] Here we first discuss the state shown in Fig. 2(a) in detail. The other state will be discussed in Sec. III D.

On each site we have **8** states in the bilinear form of **3** and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states coupled by 3×3 traceless matrices Γ^i $(i =$



FIG. 1. Weight diagrams of the Lie algebra su(3). Fundamental representation **3** consists of three basis states u, d, s (quarks). Its conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ consists of three basis states $\bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}$ (antiquarks). Adjoint representation **8** is spanned by eight bilinear forms of quarks and antiquarks, i.e., mesons.



FIG. 2. Schematic pictures of the two types of MPS wave functions for the SU(3) AKLT model. On every site there are **3** states (quark q) and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states (antiquark $\bar{q}$) which are projected onto **8** states (mesons represented by ovals) through the eight traceless matrices Γ^σ. (a) q is coupled through the Γ^0 matrix to $\bar{q}$ on the left neighboring site to form a singlet **1** (η' meson). (b) q is coupled through the Γ^0 matrix to $\bar{q}$ on the right neighboring site to form a singlet **1** (η' meson).

$1, \ldots, 8$),

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = (I^+, I^-, \sqrt{2}T^3, V^-, V^+, U^+, U^-, \sqrt{2}T^8)^T, \quad (39)$$

where the su(3) operators T^a are the ones defined in Eq. (34) and the raising and lowering operators are defined in Eq. (37). The eight states $|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\rangle$ form the adjoint representation **8** of su(3), corresponding to the octet of mesons:

$$|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\rangle = (|u\rangle, |d\rangle, |s\rangle)\mathbf{\Gamma} \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{u}\rangle \\ |\bar{d}\rangle \\ |\bar{s}\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \pi^+ \\ \pi^- \\ \pi^0 \\ K^- \\ K^+ \\ K^0 \\ \bar{K}^0 \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} |u\bar{d}\rangle \\ |d\bar{u}\rangle \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|u\bar{u} - d\bar{d}\rangle \\ |s\bar{u}\rangle \\ |u\bar{s}\rangle \\ |d\bar{s}\rangle \\ |s\bar{d}\rangle \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} - 2s\bar{s}\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

whose weight diagram is shown in Fig. 1. The su(3) generators T^a for the **8** representation are given by 8×8 matrices, which are written in this basis as

$$(T^a)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[(\Gamma^i)^\dagger(\lambda_a\Gamma^j - \Gamma^j\lambda_a)]. \quad (41)$$

With a basis transformation [replacing Γ^i with $\lambda_i/\sqrt{2}$ in Eqs. (40) and (41)], we can rewrite T^a in the standard form

$$(T^a)_{ij} = -if_{aij}, \quad (42)$$

where f_{aij} is the structure constant of su(3) defined from the commutation relation $[T^a, T^b] = if_{abc}T^c$.

The singlet state **1** on each bond is given by the bilinear form

$$\eta' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s}\rangle, \quad (43)$$

which is composed of **3** and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states from neighboring sites coupled through the matrix

$$(\Gamma^0)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\delta_{ij}. \quad (44)$$

The MPS wave function of the SU(3) AKLT state shown in Fig. 2(a) is constructed as follows. First, **3** and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states from neighboring sites are projected onto the singlet **1** using the Γ^0 matrix,

$$|\psi_{\mathbf{1}}\rangle = \sum_{\{a_i\}}\sum_{\{b_i\}} \Gamma^0_{b_1a_2}\Gamma^0_{b_2a_3}\ldots\Gamma^0_{b_{L-1}a_L}\Gamma^0_{b_La_1}|a_1b_1\ldots a_Lb_L\rangle, \quad (45)$$

where a_i and b_i label states of **3** representation and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ representation, respectively, on site i in a 1D periodic chain of length L. Second, **3** and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states on the same site are projected onto **8** states using the eight traceless matrices Γ^σ in Eq. (39),

$$|\psi_{\mathrm{sym}}\rangle = \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}}\sum_{\{a_i\}}\sum_{\{b_i\}} \Gamma^{\sigma_1}_{a_1b_1}\Gamma^0_{b_1a_2}\Gamma^{\sigma_2}_{a_2b_2}\Gamma^0_{b_2a_3}\cdots \times \Gamma^{\sigma_{L-1}}_{a_{L-1}b_{L-1}}\Gamma^0_{b_{L-1}a_L}\Gamma^{\sigma_L}_{a_Lb_L}\Gamma^0_{b_La_1}|\sigma_1\ldots\sigma_L\rangle, \quad (46)$$

where σ_i labels physical states in the **8** representation of Eq. (40). Finally, the SU(3) AKLT wave function is obtained as

$$|\Psi\rangle = C^{-1}\sum_\sigma \mathrm{tr}[A^{\sigma_1}A^{\sigma_2}\ldots A^{\sigma_L}]|\sigma_1\ldots\sigma_L\rangle, \quad (47a)$$

with

$$A^{\sigma_i} = \Gamma^{\sigma_i}\Gamma^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\Gamma^{\sigma_i}. \quad (47b)$$

The normalization constant is

$$C = \langle\psi_{\mathrm{sym}}|\psi_{\mathrm{sym}}\rangle = \left(\frac{8}{9}\right)^{L/2}. \quad (47c)$$

The wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ has the same MPS form as Eq. (5) up to the normalization factor. Alternatively, we can write the MPS wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ as[15]

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{3^{L/2}C}\mathrm{tr}[M_1M_2\cdots M_L] \quad (48a)$$

with matrices taking values in the local Hilbert space,

$$M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3}|u\bar{u}\rangle_i - \frac{1}{3}|d\bar{d}\rangle_i - \frac{1}{3}|s\bar{s}\rangle_i & |u\bar{d}\rangle_i & |u\bar{s}\rangle_i \\ |d\bar{u}\rangle_i & -\frac{1}{3}|u\bar{u}\rangle_i + \frac{2}{3}|d\bar{d}\rangle_i - \frac{1}{3}|s\bar{s}\rangle_i & |d\bar{s}\rangle_i \\ |s\bar{u}\rangle_i & |s\bar{d}\rangle_i & -\frac{1}{3}|u\bar{u}\rangle_i - \frac{1}{3}|d\bar{d}\rangle_i + \frac{2}{3}|s\bar{s}\rangle_i \end{pmatrix}. \tag{48b}$$

Let us construct a Hamiltonian having the above MPS wave function as a ground state, using projection operators acting on the **8** representations (mesons) on every pair of neighboring states, in the same way as in the SU(2) AKLT model. The product of two sets of **8** states from neighboring sites is decomposed as

$$\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} = \mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{10} \oplus \overline{\mathbf{10}} \oplus \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{1}. \tag{49}$$

However, the formation of a singlet on every bond, which was imposed in Eq. (45), implies that the maximum multiplets that can be formed by states from two neighboring sites are actually limited to

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} = \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{1}. \tag{50}$$

Therefore, if a Hamiltonian is a projection operator annihilating both **8** and **1** representations for every pair of **8** states of neighboring sites in Eq. (49), then the MPS wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ in Eq. (47) becomes a zero-energy eigenstate. We can write down such a Hamiltonian using Casimir operators as

$$H_3 = \frac{1}{4}\sum_i [(\boldsymbol{T}_i + \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 - C(\mathbf{8})][(\boldsymbol{T}_i + \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 - C(\mathbf{1})], \tag{51}$$

where T^a's are su(3) operators in the **8** representation given in Eq. (41), and $C(\boldsymbol{d})$ is the eigenvalue of the quadratic Casimir operator, $\sum_a (T^a)^2$, for d-dimensional representations. The MPS wave function in Eq. (47) is a zero-energy eigenstate of H_3, whose eigenvalues are nonnegative by construction. Hence the MPS state is an exact ground state. The other SU(3) AKLT state shown in Fig. 2(b) is another zero-energy ground state of H_3, and there is a finite energy gap to excited states.[15] Using

$$C(\mathbf{8}) = 3, \quad C(\mathbf{3}) = C(\bar{\mathbf{3}}) = \frac{4}{3}, \quad C(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \tag{52}$$

we can reduce the Hamiltonian to the simpler form

$$H_3 = \sum_i \left[(\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 + \frac{9}{2}\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1} + \frac{9}{2} \right], \tag{53}$$

which we shall call the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian in the rest of this paper. We note once again that the su(3) generators $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ are in the **8** representation.

C. Symmetry operations of $Z_3 \times Z_3$

Here we derive symmetry actions of the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry on the eight physical states $|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\rangle$ by using the projective representation $U_{x,y}$ [Eq. (33)] and Eq. (9). The operations of U_x and U_y on the octet of matrices $\Gamma^1, \ldots, \Gamma^8$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} &U_x^{-1}(\Gamma^1, \Gamma^4, \Gamma^6)U_x = (\Gamma^6, \Gamma^1, \Gamma^4), \\ &U_x^{-1}(\Gamma^2, \Gamma^5, \Gamma^7)U_x = (\Gamma^7, \Gamma^2, \Gamma^5), \\ &U_x^{-1}(\Gamma^3, \Gamma^8)U_x = \frac{1}{2}(-\Gamma^3 + \sqrt{3}\Gamma^8, -\sqrt{3}\Gamma^3 - \Gamma^8), \end{aligned} \tag{54a}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &U_y^{-1}(\Gamma^1, \Gamma^4, \Gamma^6)U_y = \omega(\Gamma^1, \Gamma^4, \Gamma^6), \\ &U_y^{-1}(\Gamma^2, \Gamma^5, \Gamma^7)U_y = \omega^2(\Gamma^2, \Gamma^5, \Gamma^7), \\ &U_y^{-1}(\Gamma^3, \Gamma^8)U_y = (\Gamma^3, \Gamma^8). \end{aligned} \tag{54b}$$

These relations determine actions of the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry operators on the eight matrices $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_8$, which we write in the form of Eq. (9) as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{8} x_{mn}\Gamma^n = U_x^{-1}\Gamma^m U_x, \qquad \sum_{n=1}^{8} y_{mn}\Gamma^n = U_y^{-1}\Gamma^m U_y, \tag{55}$$

where

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{56a}$$

$$y = \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{56b}$$

The 8×8 matrices x and y are generators of an eight-dimensional representation of the symmetry group $G = Z_3 \times Z_3$, satisfying

$$x^3 = y^3 = 1, \qquad [x, y] = 0. \tag{57}$$

By contrast, U_x and U_y in Eq. (33) make a projective representation of the symmetry group G with the phase function $\phi = \varphi$ defined in Eq. (B11), which indicates that

the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ is in the SPT phase of $1 \in \mathbb{Z}_3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$. The Hamiltonian in Eq. (53), which is made of Casimir operators of su(3), is invariant under SU(3) and therefore invariant under the symmetry group $G = Z_3 \times Z_3$, a subgroup of SU(3). More importantly, the MPS wave function (47) is also invariant under $G = Z_3 \times Z_3$ because the eight constituent matrices, $A^\sigma = \Gamma^\sigma/\sqrt{3}$, satisfy the transformation relations (55).

D. Two types of MPSs and two $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases

Let us consider the other ground-state wave function of H_3, i.e., the SU(3) AKLT state $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ shown in Fig. 2(b). Comparing Figs. 2(a) and (b), we see that $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ are related to each other by spatial inversion.[15] From Eq. (47) we can write the MPS representation of $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ as

$$|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle = C^{-1} \sum_{\sigma} \mathrm{tr}\Big(\widetilde{A}^{\sigma_1} \widetilde{A}^{\sigma_2} \dots \widetilde{A}^{\sigma_L}\Big) |\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_L\rangle, \quad (58a)$$

where

$$\widetilde{A}^\sigma = (A^\sigma)^T. \quad (58b)$$

Similarly, following Eq. (48), we can rewrite $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ as

$$|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle = \frac{1}{3^{L/2} C} \mathrm{tr}\Big(\widetilde{M}_1 \widetilde{M}_2 \cdots \widetilde{M}_L\Big) \quad (59)$$

with $\widetilde{M} = M^T$.

The two states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ are orthogonal in the thermodynamic limit. Actually, the overlap of the states vanishes,

$$\langle \Psi | \widetilde{\Psi} \rangle \propto (\epsilon'/\epsilon)^L, \quad (60)$$

as $L \to \infty$, where ϵ and ϵ' are the largest eigenvalues in magnitude of transfer matrices $\mathcal{M} = \sum_m A^m \otimes (A^m)^*$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \sum_m (A^m)^T \otimes (A^m)^*$, respectively ($\epsilon = 8/9, \epsilon' = -4/9$).

The MPS wave function $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ describes a ground state in one of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases (i.e., $2 \in \mathbb{Z}_3$) and realizes a projective representation of the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry as follows. The operations of the generators x, y of the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry in Eq. (56) on the wave function $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ induces the transformations of the matrices $\widetilde{A}^n$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{8} x_{mn} \widetilde{A}^n = \widetilde{U}_x^{-1} \widetilde{A}^m \widetilde{U}_x, \qquad \sum_{n=1}^{8} y_{mn} \widetilde{A}^n = \widetilde{U}_y^{-1} \widetilde{A}^m \widetilde{U}_y, \quad (61a)$$

with

$$\widetilde{U}_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \widetilde{U}_y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}. \quad (61b)$$

These two matrices $\widetilde{U}_x, \widetilde{U}_y$ give a projective representation of $Z_3 \times Z_3$ and satisfy

$$\widetilde{U}_x^3 = \widetilde{U}_y^3 = 1_3, \qquad \widetilde{U}_x \widetilde{U}_y = \omega^2 \widetilde{U}_y \widetilde{U}_x. \quad (62)$$

The phase function $\tilde{\phi}$ in this projective representation is a nontrivial 2-cocycle and given by

$$\tilde{\phi} = 2\varphi \quad (63)$$

with φ in Eq. (B11). Thus the MPS wave function $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ belongs to the SPT phase of $2 \in \mathbb{Z}_3$. To summarize, both MPS wave functions, $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ made of matrices A^n and $\widetilde{A}^n$ respectively, are zero-energy ground states of the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian [Eq. (53)] and belong to two different SPT phases which are characterized by the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ topological index as 1 and 2 ($\in \mathbb{Z}_3$), respectively.

Actually, the two states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ should be considered as two-fold degenerate SPT ground "states" in a *single* gapped SPT phase. The situation is similar to the two-dimensional ferromagnetic Ising model, where the low-temperature ordered phase is a single gapped phase with two-fold degenerate ground states with ferromagnetic long-range order. The degeneracy is lifted by applying a finite magnetic field along the Ising spin direction, and changing the sign of the magnetic field leads to a first-order phase transition between the two ferromagnetically ordered states. Our SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian is symmetric under inversion and is similar to the ferromagnetic Ising model without a field. In analogy with the Ising model, we expect that the SU(3) AKLT model should have a first-order phase transition between the two SPT "states" $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ when we change the sign of an inversion symmetry breaking term added to the model. Without such a term, we have a single gapped phase with doubly degenerate ground states under the periodic boundary condition. Under open boundary conditions, the inversion symmetry is manifestly broken by the appearance of different kinds of boundary zero modes (**3** or $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states) at the left and right boundaries, and the ground state is 18-fold degenerate ($2 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 = 18$) if we neglect exponentially small coupling between the left and right boundary modes. In Sec. VIA, we will present an $S = 1$ spin chain with staggered quadrupole couplings which breaks the inversion symmetry explicitly. There we find a unique ground state (under periodic boundary conditions) that is a nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase.

Finally, we note that the SU(3) AKLT model can also be thought of as a PSU(3) AKLT model realizing $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT states protected by PSU(3) symmetry.[17,18] This is because the adjoint representation **8** is also a representation of PSU(3) and the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian H_3 respects the PSU(3) symmetry. Furthermore, **3** or $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states appearing at the ends of a spin chain give projective representations of PSU(3) corresponding to 1 and $-1 \in H^2(\mathrm{PSU}(3), \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_3$, respectively. Thus the two states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ represent two $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT states protected by PSU(3) symmetry group.

E. SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian

In a similar way to the SU(3) case, we can obtain an SU(N) generalization of the AKLT Hamiltonian as follows. We consider a 1D chain in which the local Hilbert space on each site is spanned by the $\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$ (adjoint) representation of su(N). Then the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian is constructed from projection operators for two neighboring sites:

$$H_N = \frac{1}{4}\sum_i [(\boldsymbol{T}_i + \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 - C(\boldsymbol{N^2-1})] \times [(\boldsymbol{T}_i + \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 - C(\boldsymbol{1})], \tag{64}$$

where T^a ($a = 1, \ldots, N^2-1$) are su(N) operators in the $\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$ representation, and $C(\boldsymbol{d})$ is the eigenvalue of a quadratic Casimir operator for d-dimensional representations. With the eigenvalues of Casimir operators

$$C(\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) = N, \quad C(\boldsymbol{N}) = \frac{N^2-1}{2N}, \quad C(\boldsymbol{1}) = 0, \tag{65}$$

the SU(N) extension of the AKLT Hamiltonian is reduced to

$$H_N = \sum_i \left[(\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2 + \frac{3N}{2}\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1} + \frac{N^2}{2} \right], \tag{66}$$

which we call the SU(N) AKLT model.[27] It is a natural generalization of the SU(2) $S = 1$ AKLT model and the SU(3) AKLT model, in that the generators $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ are in the adjoint representation as in these two models. Since the tensor product of two adjoint representations $\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$ of su(N) ($N \geq 4$) are decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) &\otimes (\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) \\ &= \frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{4}}\boldsymbol{N^2(N+3)(N-1)} \oplus \frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{4}}\boldsymbol{(N^2-1)(N^2-4)} \\ &\quad \oplus \overline{\frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{4}}\boldsymbol{(N^2-1)(N^2-4)}} \oplus \frac{\boldsymbol{1}}{\boldsymbol{4}}\boldsymbol{N^2(N+1)(N-3)} \\ &\quad \oplus (\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) \oplus (\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) \oplus \boldsymbol{1},\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

the energy spectrum of the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian H_N is non-negative.

We can easily construct the zero-energy ground-state wave function of H_N as an SU(N) extension of the AKLT wave function. Suppose that each site of a 1D chain consists of virtual degrees of freedom spanned by the fundamental representation $\boldsymbol{N}$ and its conjugate representation $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$ of su(N). Using the decomposition

$$\boldsymbol{N} \otimes \overline{\boldsymbol{N}} = (\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) \oplus \boldsymbol{1}, \tag{68}$$

we construct an SU(N) AKLT wave function by projecting virtual $\boldsymbol{N}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$ states onto physical $\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$ states at every site and onto the singlet $\boldsymbol{1}$ at every bond, as we have done for $N = 3$ in Sec. III B. We can write the SU(N) AKLT wave function in the MPS form analogous to Eq. (47) by replacing $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ with the generators of the fundamental representation of su(N). By construction, the above SU(N) AKLT wave function is a zero-energy ground state of the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian H_N. Since the fundamental representation $\boldsymbol{N}$ and its conjugate representation $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$ are different for $N > 2$, the ground state of H_N is twofold degenerate (under periodic boundary conditions) as in the $N = 3$ case ($|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ schematically shown in Fig. 2). These degenerate ground states realize two distinct phases of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ SPT phases ($1, -1 \in \mathbb{Z}_N$), as one can verify by determining the action of the $Z_N \times Z_N$ symmetry in a similar way to Eq. (56). However, as we have discussed earlier, we should consider these two states as two-fold degenerate ground states in a *single* SPT phase. Under open boundary conditions the ground state is $2N^2$-fold degenerate.

Let us compute the correlation functions of the SU(N) operators T^a (in the $\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$ representation) for the SU(N) AKLT states. We use the following properties of the transfer matrix

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{m=1}^{N^2-1} A^m \otimes (A^m)^*, \tag{69}$$

which are derived in Appendix C. The transfer matrix has eigenvectors satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}|v_0\rangle = \epsilon_1 |v_0\rangle, \tag{70a}$$

$$\mathcal{M}|v_m\rangle = \epsilon_2 |v_m\rangle, \qquad (m = 1, \ldots, N^2-1), \tag{70b}$$

with the ratio of the eigenvalues

$$\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1} = \frac{-1}{N^2-1}. \tag{70c}$$

In order to compute the correlation function of T^a, we define another transfer matrix

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a = \sum_{m,n=1}^{N^2-1} T^a_{mn} A^n \otimes (A^m)^*. \tag{71}$$

Then the correlation function for the SU(N) AKLT state $|\Psi\rangle$ is written as

$$\langle \Psi | T^a_i T^a_j | \Psi \rangle = \frac{\langle v_0 | \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a \mathcal{M}^{i-j-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a | v_0 \rangle}{\langle v_0 | \mathcal{M}^{i-j+1} | v_0 \rangle}, \tag{72}$$

where we assume $i > j$. We can show that the vector $|v_0\rangle$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a|v_0\rangle$ are orthogonal,

$$\langle v_0 | \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a | v_0 \rangle = 0 \tag{73}$$

for any $a = 1, \ldots, N^2-1$, which implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a|v_0\rangle$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{M}$ with the eigenvalue ϵ_2. For the derivation of Eqs. (70) and (73), see Appendix C. Now we can compute the correlation function as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Psi | T^a_i T^a_j | \Psi \rangle &= \frac{\epsilon_2^{i-j-1} \langle v_0 | \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a | v_0 \rangle}{\epsilon_1^{i-j+1}} \\ &\propto \left(\frac{-1}{N^2-1} \right)^{i-j}.\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Thus the correlation function decays exponentially with the correlation length[27]

$$\xi_N = \frac{1}{\ln(N^2-1)}, \tag{75}$$

which indicates the existence of a finite energy gap between the ground state and excited states of the SU(N) AKLT Hamiltonian H_N.

IV. STRING ORDER AND HIDDEN $Z_3 \times Z_3$ SYMMETRY BREAKING

In this section we discuss hidden order in the ground state of the SU(3) AKLT model. A hidden order characterized by the string order parameter[5] was first found in the Haldane phase, where the nonvanishing string order corresponds to a hidden $Z_2 \times Z_2$ symmetry breaking in the system obtained after a nonunitary transformation.[6,7] A generalization of the string order was discussed recently for SPT phases with $Z_N \times Z_N$ symmetry.[17,20] Here we demonstrate the existence of a hidden order in the ground state of the SU(3) AKLT model, i.e., in the matrix product state in Eq. (47). Throughout this section we assume the symmetry of the system to be SU(3), rather than $Z_3 \times Z_3$ that we have assumed in the preceding sections. Accordingly, the string order parameters that we define below are different from those studied in Refs. 17 and 20 and give natural generalization of the conventional string order of the SU(2) symmetric Haldane phase. However, assuming full SU(3) symmetry has the disadvantage of losing direct contact with the nonlocal unitary transformation with which the hidden order can be related to $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry breaking.

We study hidden order in the matrix product state $|\Psi\rangle$ in Eq. (48). Let us consider the following "up" operator

$$\mathcal{O}_i^u = T_i^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} T_i^8. \tag{76}$$

From the weight diagram (Fig. 1) of **8** representation, it is clear that this operator has three eigenvalues 1, 0, and -1. Since the matrix elements of M_i in Eq. (48b) are eigenvectors of $\mathcal{O}_i^u$, we can schematically rewrite M_i as

$$M \to \begin{pmatrix} |0\rangle^u & |1\rangle^u & |1\rangle^u \\ |-1\rangle^u & |0\rangle^u & |0\rangle^u \\ |-1\rangle^u & |0\rangle^u & |0\rangle^u \end{pmatrix}, \tag{77}$$

where we have omitted other indices and coefficients and introduced the eigenvectors as $\mathcal{O}^u|\pm 1\rangle^u = \pm|\pm 1\rangle^u$ and $\mathcal{O}^u|0\rangle^u = 0$. Performing multiplication of the matrices M_i explicitly, we see that the eigenstates $|1\rangle^u$ and $|-1\rangle^u$ appear in an alternating fashion in all the product states included in the expansion of $|\Psi\rangle$ if we ignore the states $|0\rangle^u$. For example, the expansion contains states such as

$$\cdots |0\rangle^u_{i-2}|1\rangle^u_{i-1}|-1\rangle^u_i|0\rangle^u_{i+1}|0\rangle^u_{i+2}|1\rangle^u_{i+3}|0\rangle^u_{i+4}|-1\rangle^u_{i+5}\cdots .$$

This structure is exactly the same as the hidden order in the SU(2) AKLT state.[5,6] We thus define the string order parameter of up quarks as

$$\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str} = \lim_{|j-k|\to\infty} \lim_{L\to\infty} \langle\Psi|\mathcal{O}_j^u \exp\left(i\pi \sum_{j\le l<k} \mathcal{O}_l^u\right) \mathcal{O}_k^u|\Psi\rangle, \tag{78}$$

where the wave function is normalized as $\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle = 1$. Using the method developed in Refs. 28–30, we explicitly calculate the string correlation

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \langle\Psi|\mathcal{O}_j^u \exp\left(i\pi \sum_{j\le l<k} \mathcal{O}_l^u\right) \mathcal{O}_k^u|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4}\left(-\frac{1}{8}\right)^{k-j} \tag{79}$$

and obtain $\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str} = 1/4$.

Similarly, we can define two other flavor operators

$$\mathcal{O}_i^d = -T_i^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} T_i^8, \tag{80}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_i^s = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} T_i^8. \tag{81}$$

From the weight diagram it is clear that these two operators also have the eigenvalues $-1, 0, 1$. These three flavor operators $\mathcal{O}^\alpha$ ($\alpha = u, d, s$) are related to each other through the Z_3 transformation U_x in Eq. (33) in the **3** representation. Hence the state $|\Psi\rangle$ has the same string order $\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str} = \mathcal{O}_d^{\rm str} = \mathcal{O}_s^{\rm str} = 1/4$.

Let us introduce another set of operators defined by

$$\mathcal{O}_i^a = \frac{1}{3}(I_i^+ + I_i^- + U_i^+ + U_i^- + V_i^+ + V_i^-), \tag{82}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_i^b = \frac{1}{3}(\omega^2 I_i^+ + \omega I_i^- + \omega^2 U_i^+ + \omega U_i^- + \omega V_i^+ + \omega^2 V_i^-), \tag{83}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_i^c = (\mathcal{O}_i^b)^* \tag{84}$$

with the raising and lowering operators $I^\pm, U^\pm, V^\pm$ in Eq. (37). These three operators are transformed to each other by the other Z_3 transformation U_y in Eq. (33) in the **3** representation. We can find the eigenvalues of these operators in the **8** representation by considering the following new basis states of the **3** representation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |a\rangle \\ |b\rangle \\ |c\rangle \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} |u\rangle \\ |d\rangle \\ |s\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad W \equiv \frac{-i}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}. \tag{85}$$

The conjugate basis states are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\bar{a}\rangle \\ |\bar{b}\rangle \\ |\bar{c}\rangle \end{pmatrix} = (W^{-1})^T \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{u}\rangle \\ |\bar{d}\rangle \\ |\bar{s}\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \tag{86}$$

This follows from a representation of the SU(3) matrix W as $W = \exp(ix^a\lambda^a)$ and its conjugate representation

$\exp[ix^a(-\lambda^a)^T] = (W^{-1})^T$. These states ($|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, and $|c\rangle$) and their conjugate states ($|\bar{a}\rangle$, $|\bar{b}\rangle$, and $|\bar{c}\rangle$) are eigenvectors of the operators $\mathcal{O}_i^\alpha$ ($\alpha = a, b, c$). From Eq. (48a) we note that the same MPS wave function $|\Psi\rangle$ can be obtained by replacing the matrix M with WMW^{-1}, which takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} WMW^{-1} &= W \begin{pmatrix} |u\rangle \\ |d\rangle \\ |s\rangle \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{u}\rangle & |\bar{d}\rangle & |\bar{s}\rangle \end{pmatrix} W^{-1} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s}\rangle 1_3, \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} |a\rangle \\ |b\rangle \\ |c\rangle \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{a}\rangle & |\bar{b}\rangle & |\bar{c}\rangle \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{3}|a\bar{a} + b\bar{b} + c\bar{c}\rangle 1_3. \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Being similar to M, the matrix WMW^{-1} can be schematically written as

$$WMW^{-1} \to \begin{pmatrix} |0\rangle^a & |1\rangle^a & |1\rangle^a \\ |-1\rangle^a & |0\rangle^a & |0\rangle^a \\ |-1\rangle^a & |0\rangle^a & |0\rangle^a \end{pmatrix}, \tag{88}$$

where $\mathcal{O}^a|\pm 1\rangle^a = \pm|\pm 1\rangle^a$, $\mathcal{O}^a|0\rangle^a = 0$, and we have omitted coefficients and other indices to simplify presentation. Since the eigenvectors are arranged in the transformed matrix in the same way as in Eq. (77), the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{O}^a$ also have a hidden order, which can be measured by the string order parameter

$$\mathcal{O}_a^{\rm str} = \lim_{|j-k|\to\infty} \lim_{L\to\infty} \langle\Psi|\mathcal{O}_j^a \exp\left(i\pi \sum_{j\le l<k} \mathcal{O}_l^a\right) \mathcal{O}_k^a|\Psi\rangle. \tag{89}$$

We obtain $\mathcal{O}_a^{\rm str} = \mathcal{O}_b^{\rm str} = \mathcal{O}_c^{\rm str} = 1/4$.

We note that the above string correlations are meaningful indicators of hidden order in SU(3) symmetric systems, but they are not necessarily so in $Z_3\times Z_3$ symmetric ones. In order for the string correlations to have finite values in the limit $k - j \to \infty$, the largest eigenvalues of the two transfer matrices,

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_m A^m \otimes (A^m)^*, \tag{90}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_{m,n} (e^{i\pi\mathcal{O}^\alpha})_{mn} A^n \otimes (A^m)^*, \tag{91}$$

must have the same absolute values. Otherwise, the string correlations vanish in the limit $k - j \to \infty$. Since the operator $g = e^{i\pi\mathcal{O}^\alpha}$ is an element of SU(3), the eigenvalues of the two transfer matrices coincide if the system has the SU(3) symmetry. In fact, using Eq. (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} &= \sum_{m,n} g_{mn} A^n \otimes (A^m)^* \\ &= \sum_m e^{i\theta_g} U_g^{-1} A^m U_g \otimes (A^m)^* \\ &= e^{i\theta_g} (U_g \otimes 1)^{-1} \mathcal{M} (U_g \otimes 1), \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

and all the eigenvalues coincide up to a U(1) phase factor. However, since $e^{i\pi\mathcal{O}_l^u}$ is not an element of $Z_3 \times Z_3$, the largest eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ generally do not coincide for $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetric systems. Therefore the above discussion on the string order is valid only under the assumption that the system has SU(3) symmetry (not only the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry).

Lastly, we examine the relation between boundary states and hidden symmetry breaking. While a general theory of a nonlocal $Z_N \times Z_N$ symmetry breaking is presented in Ref. 20, we explicitly demonstrate here that a $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry breaking takes place in our model by choosing appropriate boundary states. We consider the MPS under open boundary conditions

$$|\Psi(a\bar{u})\rangle = \frac{1}{3^{L/2}C} v_a^\dagger M_1 M_2 \cdots M_L v_{\bar{u}}, \tag{93}$$

where we have chosen the right boundary state $|\bar{u}\rangle$ at $j = L$ to be $v_{\bar{u}} = (1, 0, 0)^T$ and the left boundary state $|a\rangle$ at $j = 1$ to be $v_a^\dagger = (1, 1, 1)/\sqrt{3}$. To see a hidden symmetry breaking in $|\Psi(a\bar{u})\rangle$, we define the string operators

$$O_j^{\alpha,{\rm str}} = \mathcal{O}_j^\alpha \exp\left(i\pi \sum_{j<k\le L} \mathcal{O}_k^\alpha\right) \tag{94}$$

for $\alpha = u, d, s$, where the "string" operator extends from the right edge ($k = L$) to the site j in the bulk. With the right boundary state set to $|\bar{u}\rangle$, we obtain the expectation values of the string operators as

$$\langle O_j^{u,{\rm str}}\rangle_{a\bar{u}} = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\left(-\frac{1}{8}\right)^{L-j} + \mathcal{O}\big((-1/8)^j\big) \tag{95a}$$

and

$$\langle O_j^{\alpha,{\rm str}}\rangle_{a\bar{u}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{8}\left(-\frac{1}{8}\right)^{L-j} + \mathcal{O}\big((-1/8)^j\big) \tag{95b}$$

for $\alpha = d, s$. Here $\langle O\rangle_{a\bar{u}} := \langle\Psi(a\bar{u})|O|\Psi(a\bar{u})\rangle$. We note that these results hold for arbitrary left boundary states at $j = 1$. This indicates that a hidden Z_3 symmetry is broken in the bulk in the direction selected by the applied boundary field (state).

Similarly, we consider the other set of Z_3 string operators defined by

$$O_j^{\alpha,{\rm str}} = \exp\left(i\pi \sum_{1\le k<j} \mathcal{O}_k^\alpha\right) \mathcal{O}_j^\alpha \tag{96}$$

for $\alpha = a, b, c$, where the "string" operators connect the left edge ($k = 1$) to the site j in the bulk. Since the left boundary state is set to $|a\rangle$, we obtain

$$\langle O_j^{a,{\rm str}}\rangle_{a\bar{u}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}\left(-\frac{1}{8}\right)^{j-1} + \mathcal{O}\big((-1/8)^{L-j}\big), \tag{97a}$$

and

$$\langle O_j^{\alpha,\mathrm{str}}\rangle_{a\bar{u}} = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8}\left(-\frac{1}{8}\right)^{j-1} + \mathcal{O}\big((-1/8)^{L-j}\big) \quad (97b)$$

for $\alpha = b, c$. These results also hold for arbitrary right boundary states. This indicates that another hidden Z_3 symmetry is broken in the bulk by selecting the left boundary state. We note that the string operators defined in Eqs. (94) and (96) take different expectation values for the two ground-state wave functions $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\widetilde{\Psi}\rangle$ of H_3, as they are operators without inversion symmetry. On the other hand, the string correlation function in Eq. (78) takes the same value for the two states.

We can perform the Z_3 rotation of the "symmetry broken" state [Eq. (93)] by applying the Z_3 transformations x and y given in Eq. (56), under which the boundary states are transformed projectively with U_x and U_y as in Eq. (18). It turns out that the two Z_3 transformations x and y act differently on the two sets of the expectation values of the string operators $\langle O_j^{\alpha,\mathrm{str}}\rangle_{a\bar{u}}$. In fact, U_x causes the Z_3 rotation only among the right boundary states $\{|\bar{u}\rangle, |\bar{d}\rangle, |\bar{s}\rangle\}$ and does not change the left boundary states $|\alpha\rangle$ ($\alpha = a, b, c$) up to phase factors (e.g., $v_a^\dagger U_x^{-1} = v_a^\dagger$). Thus an action of x interchanges the values of $\langle O_j^{\alpha,\mathrm{str}}\rangle$ for $\alpha = u, d, s$, without changing those of $\alpha = a, b, c$. Similarly, U_y causes the Z_3 rotation among the left boundary states $\{|a\rangle, |b\rangle, |c\rangle\}$ without changing the right boundary states $|\bar{\alpha}\rangle$ ($\alpha = u, d, s$) up to phase factors (e.g., $U_y v_{\bar{u}} = v_{\bar{u}}$) so that y interchanges the values of $\langle O_j^{\alpha,\mathrm{str}}\rangle$ for $\alpha = a, b, c$ only. Therefore, two independent Z_3 symmetries (i.e., hidden $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry) are broken in the SU(3) AKLT state with boundary vectors given in Eq. (93).

V. DMRG RESULTS

In Sec. III we have constructed the SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian, which turns out to be a special case of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian. In this section we study the latter Hamiltonian by means of the iDMRG[21–23] and obtain its ground-state phase diagram.

A. SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model

We study the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian

$$H_\theta = \sum_i [\cos\theta\, \boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1} + \sin\theta\, (\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})^2], \quad (98)$$

where $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ are su(3) generators in **8** representation. The SU(3) AKLT Hamiltonian (53) is a special case of H_θ at $\theta = \arctan(2/9)$ (up to an overall numerical factor). Obviously, H_θ is invariant under any SU(3) transformation, thereby invariant under the symmetry group $Z_3 \times Z_3$.

Figure 3(a) shows the phase diagram of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian [Eq. (98)] with θ in the parameter range $[-0.2\pi, \arctan(2/9)]$. We have the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase for $\theta \gtrsim -0.027\pi$ and a dimer phase for $\theta \lesssim -0.027\pi$. We note that for $\theta \gtrsim -0.027\pi$, one of the two SPT states shown in Fig. 2 is spontaneously selected in the iDMRG calculation, because a macroscopic superposition of two SPT states needs twice as many kept states in an MPS representation as either one of two SPT states of the same energy does. In the dimer phase,



FIG. 3. (a) Phase diagram of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian. (b) The string order $\mathcal{O}_u^{\mathrm{str}}$ [Eq. (78)] and the dimer order $\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{dim}}$ [Eq. (99)] as functions of θ. The number of kept states m in the iDMRG calculation is taken up to $m = 200$. Plotted are the values of data extrapolated to the limit of vanishing truncation errors $\varepsilon \to 0$. The inset shows an example of the extrapolation for $\mathcal{O}_u^{\mathrm{str}}$ at $\theta = 0$ with a quadratic fit. The dotted line indicates the phase boundary between the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and the dimer phase at $\theta_c \approx -0.027\pi$. The broken curves are to guide the eye. (c) The entanglement entropy S [Eq. (102)] as a function of the correlation length ξ [Eq. (103)] at $\theta = -0.0277\pi$, where ξ takes a maximum value for $m = 400$ as shown in the inset. The solid line shows the asymptotic behavior of the entanglement entropy at criticality with the central charge $c = 16/5$.

the translation symmetry is spontaneously broken and SU(3) singlet dimers are formed by **8** states from neighboring sites, as schematically shown in Fig. 3(a). These two phases are distinguished by the string order $\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str}$ in Eq. (78) and a dimer order $\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim} = |\langle\Psi|\boldsymbol{T}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{T}_2 - \boldsymbol{T}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{T}_3|\Psi\rangle| \tag{99}$$

for an infinite MPS with two-site periodicity. We find a finite string order ($\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str} > 0$) and no dimer order ($\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim} = 0$) in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase, while $\mathcal{O}_u^{\rm str} = 0$ and $\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim} > 0$ in the dimer phase, as shown in Fig. 3(b).

We determine the phase transition point θ_c as follows. We first perform extrapolations of $O_u^{\rm str}, O^{\rm dim}$ with the truncation error[21,22] for each value of θ. The truncation error is defined by $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=m+1}^{8m} w_i^2$ in the final numerical iteration of iDMRG, where m is the number of kept internal states. Numerically accurate estimates for the order parameters can be obtained by taking extrapolations to $\varepsilon \to 0$. Following Ref. 31, we fit order parameters with a quadratic form of ε as shown in the inset of Fig. 3(b). Errors of data points in Fig. 3(b) are smaller than the symbols except for those at $\theta = -0.027\pi$ and -0.028π. However, we did not obtain reasonable quadratic fits for the data of $m \le 200$ in the range $-0.027\pi \le \theta \le -0.020\pi$. We then fit extrapolated values of $O_u^{\rm str}$ and $O^{\rm dim}$ with power-law functions $f_{\rm str} = a(\theta-\theta_c)^\beta$ and $f_{\rm dim} = a'(\theta_c'-\theta)^{\beta'}$ in the vicinity of the phase boundary, where a, a', θ_c, θ_c', β and β' are fitting parameters. We obtain θ_c and θ_c' from fitting of the data in the range $-0.019\pi \le \theta \le -0.01\pi$ and $-0.037\pi \le \theta \le -0.028\pi$ as

$$\theta_c/\pi = -0.028^{+0.002}_{-0.003}, \quad \theta_c'/\pi = -0.027^{+0.005}_{-0.001}. \tag{100}$$

We find that the fitting parameters vary when we change fitting ranges even in the region where we obtain good extrapolations of $O_u^{\rm str}$ and $O^{\rm dim}$ to $\varepsilon \to 0$, because these regions are not sufficiently close to the critical point. Thus the parameters obtained from our numerical calculation may not be very reliable by themselves. However, if we assume that the phase transition takes place at a single point, i.e., $\theta_c = \theta_c'$, then the combination of the estimates for θ_c and θ_c' can provide a more reliable estimate for the critical point θ_c. Furthermore, the critical point should be located in between the regions where either of the two order parameters is finite. We find the overlapping region to be $\theta_c/\pi = -0.027 \pm 0.001$ from θ_c and θ_c' in Eq. (100). Thus, we conclude that the critical point is at $\theta_c/\pi = -0.027 \pm 0.001$.

B. Criticality at the phase transition

We study criticality at the phase transition between the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and the dimer phase, using the scaling of the entanglement entropy of a bipartition. The entanglement entropy is given by

$$S = {\rm Tr}[-\rho_{\rm L}\ln\rho_{\rm L}], \tag{101}$$

where $\rho_{\rm L}$ is a reduced density matrix given by an integral of the density matrix over the Hilbert space of the right chain as $\rho_{\rm L} = {\rm Tr}_R|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$. Critical points of 1D quantum systems are described by conformal field theories. In the vicinity of a critical point, the entanglement entropy S increases logarithmically with the correlation length ξ of the system as

$$S \sim \frac{c}{6}\ln\xi + S_0, \tag{102}$$

where c is the central charge of the underlying conformal field theory and S_0 is a nonuniversal constant.[32,33] For a wave function of the MPS form, the correlation length ξ is given by[34]

$$\xi = \frac{1}{\ln|\mu_1/\mu_2|}, \tag{103}$$

where μ_1 and μ_2 are dominant and subdominant eigenvalues of the two-site transfer matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \sum_{m_1,m_2} A_1^{m_1}A_2^{m_2}\otimes(A_1^{m_1}A_2^{m_2})^*. \tag{104}$$

Here we consider the two-site transfer matrix rather than the single-site transfer matrix in order to obtain a unique dominant eigenvalue μ_1 in the dimer phase where wave functions break the translation symmetry and have a period of two sites.[35] In Fig. 3(c), we show the entanglement entropy plotted as a function of ξ at $\theta = -0.0277\pi$ which is the peak position of ξ for $m = 400$ [see the inset of Fig. 3(c)] This peak position is consistent with the estimate $\theta_c/\pi = -0.027 \pm 0.001$. From this analysis, we find that the entanglement entropy S fits well to the formula of Eq. (102) with $c = 16/5$.

Since the bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian H_θ has SU(3) symmetry, we expect that the critical point should be described by an SU(3) Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) model with some level k, i.e., $\mathrm{SU}(3)_k$ WZW model. The central charge of the $\mathrm{SU}(N)_k$ WZW model is

$$c = \frac{k(N^2-1)}{k+N}. \tag{105}$$

It is well known that the transition between the Haldane phase and the dimer phase in the SU(2) bilinear-biquadratic model for $S = 1$ spins is described by the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_2$ WZW model, which has $c = 3/2$.[36–38] It is also known that the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model in **6** representation shows a criticality described by the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_2$ WZW model ($c = 16/5$).[39,40] Thus the central charge $c = 16/5$ observed in Fig. 3(c) suggests that the criticality between the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and the dimer phase is also described by the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_2$ WZW model.

Assuming the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_2$ WZW criticality, we might speculate the critical exponent for the dimer order β' as follows. The effective action around the critical point is

$$S(g) = S_{\rm WZW}(g) + t\int d^2x\ \Phi, \tag{106}$$

where $S_{\rm WZW}(g)$ is the action of the SU(3)$_2$ WZW model, g is an SU(3) matrix field, and the coupling constant $t \propto \theta - \theta_c$. The operator Φ is a relevant operator that is an SU(3) symmetric scalar and respects translation symmetry. The WZW model for our system of SU(3) spins in the adjoint representation is presumably obtained in the strong-interaction limit of a Hubbard model of fermions with three flavors and two colors (labeling a quark and an antiquark). The quark fermions are 1/3-filled and the antiquark fermions are 2/3-filled. We speculate that a relevant operator permitted by the symmetry is unique and is the primary field Φ corresponding to the adjoint representation, whose scaling dimension is[36,37,41,42]

$$x = \frac{2C(\boldsymbol{N^2-1})}{N+k} = \frac{6}{5}. \tag{107}$$

If so, then from the scaling equation

$$\frac{dt}{d\ln L} = (2-x)t, \tag{108}$$

we find that the correlation length ξ diverges as

$$\xi \propto |\theta - \theta_c|^{-\nu}, \qquad \nu = \frac{1}{2-x} = \frac{5}{4}. \tag{109}$$

By an analogy with the SU(2) case,[36,37] we speculate that the dimer order is given by the operator $\mathrm{tr}\, g$ in the WZW model, whose scaling dimension is

$$x_{\rm dim} = \frac{2C(\boldsymbol{N})}{N+k} = \frac{8}{15}. \tag{110}$$

Since the dimer order parameter scales with the correlation length as $\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim} \propto 1/\xi^{x_{\rm dim}}$, the critical behavior of the dimer order β' is presumably given by

$$\mathcal{O}^{\rm dim} \propto (\theta_c - \theta)^{\beta'}, \qquad \beta' = \nu x_{\rm dim} = \frac{2}{3}. \tag{111}$$

Unfortunately, we could not obtain reliable estimates for the critical exponents ν and β' from our numerical data presented in Fig. 3(b), because, with the limited number of kept states and CPU time, our iDMRG calculation did not reach sufficiently good convergence for the dimer and string order parameters in the very vicinity of the critical point.

C. Entanglement spectrum

We study the entanglement spectrum in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and the dimer phase. The entanglement spectrum $\{\zeta_i\}$ is defined, via the entanglement Hamiltonian[43]

$$H_E = -\ln \rho_L = \sum_i \zeta_i |\psi_n^L\rangle_i \, \langle \psi_n^L|_i, \tag{112a}$$

by

$$\zeta_i = -\ln w_i^2 \tag{112b}$$



FIG. 4. Entanglement spectrum of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic model [Eq. (98)] for (a) $\theta/\pi = 0.05$ in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and (b) $\theta/\pi = -0.1$ in the dimer phase. The left/right panel in (b) shows entanglement spectrum of the chain divided without/with cutting a singlet dimer. The numbers enclosed in squares indicate the degeneracy of multiplets in the entanglement spectra.



FIG. 5. Young tableau of the $[n, m]$ representation of SU(3).

where left singular vectors $|\psi_n^L\rangle_i$ and singular values w_i are introduced in Eq. (1). The entanglement spectrum in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase shown in Fig. 4 (a) has the degeneracy in multiples of three. This signals that the ground state is in the SPT phase protected by $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry. In the dimer phase, the entanglement spectrum depends on the position where we cut the spin chain, because the ground state breaks the translation symmetry [Fig. 4 (b)].

Since H_θ has the SU(3) symmetry, eigenstates of the entanglement Hamiltonian form SU(3) multiplets. Irreducible representations of SU(3) are specified by two integers as $[n, m]$, with the Young tableau shown in Fig. 5. The dimension of the $[n, m]$ representation of SU(3) is[26]

$$D(n,m) = \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(m+1)(n+m+2), \tag{113}$$

and for the first few irreducible representations $D(0,0) = 1$, $D(1,0) = 3$, $D(1,1) = 8$, $D(2,0) = 6$, $D(2,1) = 15$, $D(2,2) = 27$, $D(3,0) = 10$, $D(3,1) = 24$. These dimensions agree with the degeneracies found in the entanglement spectrum in Fig. 4, except for the 20-fold degeneracy in the dimer phase, which might be attributed to an extra doubling due to a dimer formation.

VI. BUILDING SU(3) AND SU(4) MODELS WITH SU(2) SPIN CHAINS

The Haldane phase of the antiferromagnetic spin-1 chain is closely related to the dimer phase of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ chains.[44] In fact, the dimerized ground state of the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg chain with alternating exchange coupling ($J' < J$ and $J > 0$) becomes the AKLT state of the spin-1 chain in the limit $J' \to -\infty$. In this section we relate AKLT states to dimerized states for the SU(3) and SU(4) versions of the AKLT model.

A. Spin quadrupole operators and the SU(3) AKLT model

We consider SU(2) spin $S = 1$ chains with staggered biquadratic couplings and show that their ground states are in the dimer phase which is adiabatically connected to a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase of the SU(3) AKLT model introduced in Sec. III B.

1. $S = 1$ spin chains with staggered biquadratic couplings

For the three-dimensional Hilbert space of $S = 1$, we find it convenient to take the basis[45,46]

$$|x\rangle = i\frac{|1\rangle - |-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad |y\rangle = \frac{|1\rangle + |-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad |z\rangle = -i|0\rangle, \tag{114}$$

rather than the basis $|n\rangle$ diagonalizing S^z, $S^z|n\rangle = n|n\rangle$ with $n = -1, 0, 1$. In the new basis the spin operators in Eq. (20) are written as

$$(S^\alpha)_{\beta\gamma} = -i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}|\beta\rangle\langle\gamma| \qquad (\alpha, \beta, \gamma = x, y, z), \tag{115}$$

where $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ is a totally antisymmetric tensor with $\epsilon_{xyz} = +1$. We define spin quadrupole operators:

$$\boldsymbol{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} Q^{x^2-y^2} \\ Q^{3z^2-r^2} \\ Q^{yz} \\ Q^{zx} \\ Q^{xy} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} (S^x)^2 - (S^y)^2 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}[3(S^z)^2 - 2] \\ S^yS^z + S^zS^y \\ S^zS^x + S^xS^z \\ S^xS^y + S^yS^x \end{pmatrix}. \tag{116}$$

In the basis of Eq. (114), the spin and quadrupole operators are written as

$$\boldsymbol{S} = (\hat{\lambda}_7, -\hat{\lambda}_5, \hat{\lambda}_2)^T, \tag{117a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{Q} = (-\hat{\lambda}_3, \hat{\lambda}_8, -\hat{\lambda}_6, -\hat{\lambda}_4, -\hat{\lambda}_1)^T, \tag{117b}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_a = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=x,y,z} (\lambda_a)_{\alpha\beta}|\alpha\rangle\langle\beta|, \tag{117c}$$

where λ_a ($a = 1, \ldots, 8$) are the Gell-Mann matrices in Eq. (35). Thus the spin and quadrupole operators together give a set of su(3) generators ($T^a = \hat{\lambda}_a/2$) in the fundamental representation **3** if we multiply them with factors $\pm 1/2$. The quadratic Casimir operator from the operators of the ith and jth sites is then given by

$$\sum_{a=1}^{8} \hat{\lambda}_a(i)\hat{\lambda}_a(j) = \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j + \boldsymbol{Q}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}_j = 2\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j + 2(\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j)^2 - \frac{8}{3}. \tag{118}$$

Here we have used the identity

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}_j = 2(\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j)^2 + \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j - \frac{2}{3}S^2(S+1)^2. \tag{119}$$

The su(3) generators for the conjugate representation $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$, $\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a/2$, are obtained from the fundamental representation **3** as

$$\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a = -\hat{\lambda}_a^* = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} -(\lambda_a^*)_{\alpha\beta}|\alpha\rangle\langle\beta|. \tag{120}$$

The su(3) generators in the $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ representation are related to $S = 1$ spin operators as in Eqs. (117), where we replace $\hat{\lambda}_a$ with $\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a$ and replace spin dipole and quadrupole operators as

$$\boldsymbol{S} \to \boldsymbol{S}, \qquad \boldsymbol{Q} \to -\boldsymbol{Q}. \tag{121}$$

Therefore, the quadratic Casimir operator constructed from **3** at the ith site and $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ at the jth site reads

$$\sum_{a} \hat{\lambda}_a(i)\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a(j) = \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j - \boldsymbol{Q}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{Q}_j = -2(\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j)^2 + \frac{8}{3}. \tag{122}$$

Let us consider the following $S = 1$ spin chain with alternating biquadratic interactions:

$$\mathcal{H}_3 = -\sum_i \left[J'(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1} \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i,2})^2 + J(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2} \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,1})^2\right]. \tag{123}$$

Each unit cell has two $S = 1$ spins ($\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2}$), and we can regard one of them ($\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}$) as in the **3** representation and the other ($\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2}$) as $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$. From Eq. (122) we see that the Hamiltonian is a sum of the quadratic Casimir operators of **3** and $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ representations from neighboring sites. The product of **3** and $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ representations is split by the biquadratic coupling into an octet and a singlet, $\mathbf{3} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{3}} = \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{1}$. A negative sign of J' favors an octet, and a positive J favors a singlet. Therefore we expect that the ground state of $\mathcal{H}_3$ with $J' < 0$ and $J > 0$ should be adiabatically connected to the MPS wave function (47) of the SU(3) AKLT model introduced in Sec. III B. To verify this conjecture, we numerically study the ground-state properties of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ using the iDMRG method and determine the phase diagram as a function of J'/J below.



FIG. 6. (a) Phase diagram of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ as a function of J'/J with $J > 0$. Entanglement spectrum of the ground-state wave function for (b) $J'/J = \tan(\pi/3)$ and (c) $J'/J = -1$. In (b) and (c) the left (right) panels show the spectrum when we cut the spin chain at a bond between unit cells (within a unit cell), i.e., at a bond of $\bar{q}$–q (q–$\bar{q}$), where q and $\bar{q}$ are $\mathbf{3}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ states. The numbers enclosed in squares indicate the degeneracy of multiplets in the entanglement spectrum.

2. DMRG results for the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$

We obtain the ground state of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ using the iDMRG method. We show its phase diagram as a function of J'/J with $J > 0$ in Fig. 6(a). The phase diagram has two types of dimer phases which are separated at the point of uniform coupling $J'/J = 1$. At this point the ground state is spontaneously dimerized and twofold degenerate, and the energy spectrum is gapped.[47–49] Away from the transition point $J'/J = 1$, one of the two dimerization patterns is selected for the ground state.

The patterns of singlet dimers in the two dimer phases are different as shown in Fig. 6(a) and reflected in the entanglement spectra in Fig. 6(b) and (c). When the spin chain is divided at a dimerized (singlet) bond, the degeneracy of the lowest multiplet in the entanglement spectrum is three as shown in the right panel of Fig. 6(b) and the left panel of Fig. 6(c). On the other hand, when the spin chain is divided at a un-dimerized bond the degeneracy of the lowest multiplet in the entanglement spectrum is one as shown in the left panel of Fig. 6(b) and the right panel of Fig. 6(c). We note that the ground state at $J'/J = J_0$ with $J_0 > 0$ and $J_0 \neq 1$ can be transformed to the ground state at $J'/J = 1/J_0$ by site-centered inversion. Since the site-centered inversion swaps two types of dimerized bonds q–$\bar{q}$ and $\bar{q}$–q, two patterns of singlet dimers are interchanged and so are the two entanglement spectra obtained from two ways of cutting the spin chain. We also confirm that the degeneracy of the lowest multiplet in the entanglement spectrum for the dimer phase of $J'/J \leq 1$ remains the same as shown in Fig. 6(c) and does not change, in particular, across the point $J'/J = 0$, at which the spin chain is decomposed into a collection of SU(3) singlets of $\bar{q}$–q. We note that the 21-fold degeneracy and the 55-fold degeneracy in Fig. 6(b) and (c) correspond to $D(5,0), D(0,5)$ and $D(9,0), D(0,9)$ of Eq. (113), respectively.

When the spin chain is divided at a bond between unit cells, the entanglement spectrum for $J'/J < 1$ shows the degeneracy in multiples of three, as in the entanglement spectrum in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase in Fig. 4(a). This indicates that the ground-state wave function of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ with $J'/J < 1$ is adiabatically connected to the SU(3) AKLT state $|\Psi\rangle$ of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase ($1 \in \mathbb{Z}_3$) discussed in Sec. III. In the limit of $J'/J \to -\infty$, q and $\bar{q}$ states in each unit cell are projected onto an octet, and a pair of $\bar{q}$ and q from neighboring unit cells form a singlet state, which clearly indicates the connection to the SU(3) AKLT wave function in Eq. (47).

3. A model of $S = 1$ spins reducing to the SU(3) bilinear Hamiltonian in the strong-coupling limit

We shall introduce a slightly different 1D Hamiltonian of $S = 1$ spins which should belong to the same $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and reduces, in the strong-coupling limit, to the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian H_θ at $\theta = 0$. To motivate, we begin with the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ in the strong-coupling limit $-J'/J \gg 1$, where the low-energy multiplets in each unit cell are an octet, the $\mathbf{8}$ representation. The effective Hamiltonian is then obtained by writing the remaining biquadratic interactions, $-J(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2} \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,1})^2$, in the subspace of the $\mathbf{8}$ representations. In each unit cell the octet can be written as

$$|\lambda_a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\lambda_a)_{\alpha\beta} |\alpha\rangle \otimes |\beta\rangle, \tag{124}$$

where $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ are $S = 1$ spin states in the $\mathbf{3}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ representations. Thus the matrix elements of $\hat{\lambda}_a$ and $\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a$

for the octet states $|\lambda_b\rangle$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\lambda_c|\hat{\lambda}_a|\lambda_b\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\lambda_a\lambda_b\lambda_c) = d_{abc} + if_{abc},\\ \langle\lambda_c|\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a|\lambda_b\rangle &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\lambda_c\lambda_b\lambda_a) = -d_{abc} + if_{abc}.\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

Here we have used the formula

$$\lambda_a\lambda_b = \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ab}1_3 + (d_{abc} + if_{abc})\lambda_c \tag{126}$$

with a symmetric tensor d_{abc} and the structure constant f_{abc} which is an antisymmetric tensor. Noting that su(3) generators in the **8** representation are given by $T^i_{jk} = -if_{ijk}$, we see that the matrix elements in Eqs. (125) have additional contributions of the symmetric tensor d_{abc} which cannot be written in terms of su(3) generators. We note that, in the su(2) case, no such symmetric tensor appears, and the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg model with alternating exchange coupling is reduced to the spin-1 Heisenberg model in the limit of $J' \to -\infty$. To cancel the additional contributions from d_{abc} in the su(3) case, we need to modify $\mathcal{H}_3$ in Eq. (123) to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_3 =& -J'\sum_i (\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2})^2\\ &+\frac{J}{2}\sum_{i,a}\left[\hat{\lambda}_{a(i,1)} + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_{a(i,2)}\right]\left[\hat{\lambda}_{a(i+1,1)} + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_{a(i+1,2)}\right],\\ =& -J'\sum_i (\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2})^2\\ &+J\sum_i\big[-(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,2})^2 - (\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,1})^2\\ &\qquad +(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,1})^2 + \boldsymbol{S}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,1}\\ &\qquad +(\boldsymbol{S}_{i,2}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,2})^2 + \boldsymbol{S}_{i,2}\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{i+1,2}\big],\end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_{a(i,n)}$ and $\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_{a(i,n)}$ are the $\hat{\lambda}_a$ and $\hat{\bar{\lambda}}_a$ operators on the site (i,n). In the limit $J'/J \to -\infty$, this Hamiltonian reduces to the SU(3) Hamiltonian H_θ at $\theta = 0$ given in Eq. (98). As shown in Sec. V, the ground state of H_θ at $\theta = 0$ is in the same $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase as the ground state of the SU(3) AKLT model. We note that the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ is obtained by dropping several terms proportional to J in $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_3$ and has a simpler form in $S = 1$ spin operators. The iDMRG result for $\mathcal{H}_3$ shows that the nature of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase is not destroyed even with this simplification of the Hamiltonian.

4. $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry

As we discussed in Sec. III, the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase protected by $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry is characterized by projective representations of the symmetry. For the the $S = 1$ spin chains we have introduced above, the symmetry operations (in the linear representation) are defined for two spins in the unit cell,

$$\begin{aligned}x &= \exp\left\{\frac{2\pi i}{3}\left[\frac{(\hat{\lambda}_2 + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_2) - (\hat{\lambda}_5 + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_5) + (\hat{\lambda}_7 + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_7)}{\sqrt{3}}\right]\right\},\\ y &= \exp\left\{\frac{2\pi i}{3}\left[\frac{(\hat{\lambda}_3 + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_3) - \sqrt{3}(\hat{\lambda}_8 + \hat{\bar{\lambda}}_8)}{2}\right]\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

Since both models, $\mathcal{H}_3$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_3$, have $S = 1$ spins in **3** and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ representations in the unit cell, the projective representation of the symmetry group is readily seen as symmetry operations for individual $S = 1$ spins. Namely, the operation of U_x interchanges three states $|x\rangle, |y\rangle, |z\rangle$, while the operation of U_y gives different U(1) phase factors to $|x\rangle, |y\rangle, |z\rangle$.

B. SU(4) AKLT model

We are going to argue that a variant of the SU(4) symmetric Kugel-Khomskii model[24] has a dimerized ground state which is adiabatically connected to the AKLT state of a $\mathbb{Z}_4$ SPT phase. In a similar way to the case of the SU(3) AKLT model, we can obtain the SU(4) AKLT model in the strong-coupling limit.

We begin with a review of the symmetric Kugel-Khomskii model[24,50] which has two spin and two orbital degrees of freedom at each site represented by two sets of Pauli matrices s^α and τ^β:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{KK}} = J\sum_i (\boldsymbol{s}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_{i+1} + 1)(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i+1} + 1)\,. \tag{129}$$

It apparently has SU(2)×SU(2) symmetry in spin and orbital spaces and is invariant under exchanging $\boldsymbol{s}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. It is well known that the model has actually larger SU(4) symmetry,[51,52] as we briefly review below. On each site we have four states $|s^z, \tau^z\rangle$, which we label as

$$\begin{aligned}|1\rangle &= |+1,+1\rangle, \quad |2\rangle = |-1,+1\rangle,\\ |3\rangle &= |+1,-1\rangle, \quad |4\rangle = |-1,-1\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

They form basis states for the fundamental representation **4** of su(4), in which 15 generators of su(4) A^a $(a = 1,\ldots,15)$ are given by

$$s^\alpha, \tau^\alpha, s^\alpha\tau^\beta, \quad (\alpha,\beta = x,y,z). \tag{131}$$

We note that we have adopted the normalization of the su(4) generators as $\mathrm{tr}(A^aA^b) = 4\delta_{ab}$, which differs from the normalization of the su(3) generators in the previous sections. Since the Casimir operator for the $\mathbf{4}\otimes\mathbf{4}$ representation formed by the states at the ith and jth sites is given by

$$\sum_{a=1}^{15} A^a_iA^a_j = (\boldsymbol{s}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_j + 1)(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_j + 1) - 1, \tag{132}$$

the Hamiltonian in Eq. (129) can be written as a sum of Casimir operators, and therefore it has global SU(4) symmetry.

Following the discussion for the SU(3) case in Sec. VI A, let us consider a 1D lattice with the unit cell containing two sites, one with the fundamental representation **4** and the other with its conjugate representation $\bar{\mathbf{4}}$. Our idea is to make use of the quadratic Casimir operator for $\mathbf{4}\otimes\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ representation from neighboring sites to design a ground-state wave function which resembles an MPS with $\mathbb{Z}_4$ SPT order. The su(4) generators in the $\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ representation $\tilde{A}^a$ are given by

$$\tilde{A}^a = -(A^a)^*. \tag{133}$$

Thus the Casimir operator for $\mathbf{4}\otimes\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ representations is

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{a=1}^{15} A_i^a \tilde{A}_j^a =& -\left(s_i^x s_j^x - s_i^y s_j^y + s_i^z s_j^z + 1\right)\\ &\times\left(\tau_i^x \tau_j^x - \tau_i^y \tau_j^y + \tau_i^z \tau_j^z + 1\right) + 1,\end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

which, unfortunately, is less symmetric and conserves neither s^z nor τ^z. However, we can perform a unitary transformation in the $\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ representation,

$$\tilde{A}^a \to (s^y\tau^y)\tilde{A}^a(s^y\tau^y), \tag{135}$$

to transform the Casimir operator back to the form

$$\sum_{a=1}^{15} A_i^a \tilde{A}_j^a = -(\boldsymbol{s}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_j - 1)(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_j - 1) + 1, \tag{136}$$

which manifestly recovers the SU(2)×SU(2) symmetry.

The product of the **4** and $\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ representations from neighboring sites is decomposed as

$$\mathbf{4}\otimes\bar{\mathbf{4}} = \mathbf{15}\oplus\mathbf{1}. \tag{137}$$

The eigenvalue of the Casimir operator in Eq. (136) is $C(\mathbf{15}) = 4$ and $C(\mathbf{1}) = 0$. As we have discussed for the SU(3) case in Sec. III B, the MPS wave function of AKLT type which has $\mathbb{Z}_4$ SPT order is obtained by projecting the $\mathbf{4}\otimes\bar{\mathbf{4}}$ states from two neighboring sites onto **15** and **1** in alternating order along the 1D lattice. This motivates us to consider the spin-orbital model with alternating sign of coupling,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_4 =& -J'\sum_i \left(\boldsymbol{s}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_{i,2} - 1\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i,2} - 1\right)\\ &- J\sum_i \left(\boldsymbol{s}_{i,2}\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_{i+1,1} - 1\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i,2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i+1,1} - 1\right),\end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

where the spin-orbital exchange on each bond favors either **15** or **1** state depending on the sign of the coupling J' or J. In view of the numerical results for the similar model for the SU(3) case in Eq. (123), we expect that the ground state of this Hamiltonian for $J' < 0$ and $J > 0$ should be adiabatically connected to the dimerized state where a singlet is formed on every bond connecting neighboring unit cells and four states in Eq. (130) are left as zero-energy end states when the 1D lattice is cut between two unit cells.

Finally, we propose a model which reduces to the SU(4) bilinear exchange Hamiltonian in the limit of strong coupling. The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_4 =& -J'\sum_i (\boldsymbol{s}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{s}_{i,2} - 1)(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i,1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\tau}_{i,2} - 1)\\ &+ J\sum_{i,a}(A_{i,1}^a + \tilde{A}_{i,2}^a)(A_{i+1,1}^a + \tilde{A}_{i+1,2}^a),\end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

with $J > 0$ and $J' < 0$. In the limit $J' \to -\infty$, we have only the **15** representation in each unit cell. The effective Hamiltonian for the interaction between neighboring **15** representations, which can be obtained in the same way as in Sec. VI A, has the form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = J\sum_i\sum_{a=1}^{15} A_i^a A_{i+1}^a, \tag{140}$$

where A_i^a $(a = 1,\dots,15)$ are the generators of su(4) in the **15** (adjoint) representation. In view of the fact that the SU(2) and SU(3) versions of the Hamiltonian have the ground state with SPT order [$S = 1$ Haldane phase for SU(2) and the numerical result in Sec. V for SU(3)], we expect that the ground state of this Hamiltonian should be in the $\mathbb{Z}_4$ SPT phase protected by $Z_4\times Z_4$ symmetry, as in the SU(4) AKLT model. We note that the above Hamiltonian naturally has the $Z_4\times Z_4$ symmetry which is a subgroup of the SU(4) symmetry.

VII. SUMMARY

We have studied $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases protected by global $Z_3\times Z_3$ symmetry. By applying the group cohomology classification of 1D SPT phases and using nontrivial cocycles of $H^2(Z_3\times Z_3)$, we have constructed MPS wave functions of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phases, which are SU(3) extensions of the AKLT wave function. The MPS wave functions are ground states of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian at $\theta = \arctan(2/9)$ [the SU(3) AKLT model].

Using the iDMRG method, we have determined the phase diagram of the SU(3) bilinear-biquadratic Hamiltonian, which has the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ SPT phase and the dimer phase. These phases are characterized by an SU(3) version of the string order parameters and dimerization, respectively. The critical point separating the two phases is located at $\theta_c \approx -0.027\pi$. From the scaling of the entanglement entropy against the correlation length we have obtained a central charge $c = 16/5$ at the critical point, suggesting that the criticality is described by the $\text{SU}(3)_2$ WZW model.

We have pointed out that the SU(3) bilinear Hamiltonian $H_{\theta=0}$ might be realized in the SU(3) Hubbard model of two orbitals of fermions in the strong U limit.

When one orbital is tuned to be 1/3 filled and the other to be 2/3 filled, the charge and orbital sectors will be gapped, and the low-energy effective model of the two-orbital SU(3) Hubbard model will be an SU(3) spin chain in the adjoint representation. We speculate that such a system might be realized with cold atoms.

We have proposed $S = 1$ spin chains with staggered biquadratic couplings that are adiabatically connected to the SU(3) AKLT model. In view of a proposal of realizing the $S = 1$ bilinear-biquadratic model using cold atoms,[53] we consider that our $S = 1$ spin model might also be realized in cold atoms by properly engineering staggered biquadratic couplings.

We have also proposed a variant of Kugel-Khomskii model with spin-1/2 and two orbital degrees of freedom which is connected to the SU(4) AKLT model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is our pleasure to acknowledge stimulating discussions with Masaki Oshikawa. This work was supported by Grants-in-Aid from the Japan Society for Promotion of Science (Grants No. 24840047, No. 25800221, No. 23540397 and No. 24540338) and by the RIKEN iTHES Project.

Appendix A: Group cohomology

Here we briefly review the group cohomology of a group G over $U(1)$. We first define n-cochains $\phi^n \in C_n$ which are functions from G^n to $U(1)$,

$$\phi^n : G^n \to U(1). \tag{A1}$$

The set of n-cochains is denoted by C_n. Then we define coboundary operators δ^n which transform n-cochains to $(n+1)$-cochains,

$$\delta^n : C_n \to C_{n+1}, \tag{A2}$$

through the formula

$$\begin{aligned}&(\delta^n\phi^n)(g_1,\dots,g_{n+1})\\ &:= \phi^n(g_2,\dots,g_{n+1})\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^i\phi^n(g_1,\dots,g_{i-1},g_ig_{i+1},g_{i+2},\dots,g_{n+1})\\ &\quad+(-1)^{n+1}\phi^n(g_1,\dots,g_n),\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

where $g_1,\dots,g_n,g_{n+1} \in G$. Here we have assumed that actions of elements of G on $U(1)$ are trivial, i.e., g_i's are unitary operators.[54] The identity

$$\delta^{n+1}\circ\delta^n = 0 \tag{A4}$$

holds. We have a sequence of homomorphisms (cochain complex) from coboundary operators,

$$0 \to C_0 \to C_1 \to \cdots \to C_{n-1} \to C_n \to C_{n+1} \to \cdots, \tag{A5}$$

and we define cohomology groups for the above cochain complex as

$$H^n(G,U(1)) = \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta^n/\mathrm{Im}\,\delta^{n-1}. \tag{A6}$$

Here $Z_n = \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta^n$ is called n-cocycles, and $B_n = \mathrm{Im}\,\delta^{n-1}$ is n-coboundaries. Let us write down conditions for Z_2 and B_2 explicitly. A 2-cocycle $\phi^2 \in Z_2$ satisfies

$$\phi^2(g_2,g_3) - \phi^2(g_1g_2,g_3) + \phi^2(g_1,g_2g_3) - \phi^2(g_1,g_2) = 0. \tag{A7}$$

A 2-coboundary $\phi^2 \in B_2$ is obtained from a 1-cochain $\phi^1 \in C_1$ as

$$\phi^2(g_1,g_2) = \phi^1(g_2) - \phi^1(g_1g_2) + \phi^1(g_1). \tag{A8}$$

The phase functions $\phi(g_1,g_2)$ that appeared in symmetry transformations of MPSs in Sec. II satisfy the consistency condition [Eq. (14)] and the equivalence relation [Eq. (16)]. The former coincides with the 2-cocycle condition of Eq. (A7), while the latter means the equivalence up to 2-coboundaries. Thus the phase functions $\phi(g_1,g_2)$ in the symmetry transformations of MPSs are elements of the second cohomology group $H^2(G,U(1))$.

Appendix B: Group cohomology for $G = Z_N \times Z_N$

We summarize results for the second cohomology group of the group $G = Z_N \times Z_N$ over U(1), which is obtained by applying the Künneth formula and the universal coefficient theorem.[55,56] We write down a non-trivial cocycle for $H^2(Z_N \times Z_N, U(1))$.

1. Künneth formula

The universal coefficient theorem indicates an isomorphism

$$H^n(G,M) = \mathrm{Hom}[H_n(G,\mathbb{Z}),M] \oplus \mathrm{Ext}[H_{n-1}(G,\mathbb{Z}),M], \tag{B1}$$

for the cohomology over an Abelian group M and the homology over $\mathbb{Z}$. Since the Ext functor vanishes ($\mathrm{Ext}[Z,U(1)] = 0$ and $\mathrm{Ext}[Z_m,U(1)] = 0$) for $M = U(1)$, we have

$$H^n(G,U(1)) = \mathrm{Hom}[H_n(G,\mathbb{Z}),U(1)]. \tag{B2}$$

For discrete group G, $H^n(G,U(1))$ for $n \geq 1$ has a torsion part only and is given by

$$H^n(G,U(1)) = H_n(G,\mathbb{Z}) \tag{B3}$$

for $n \geq 1$. From Eq. (B3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}H_1(Z_N,\mathbb{Z}) &= H^1(Z_N,U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_N,\\ H_2(Z_N,\mathbb{Z}) &= H^2(Z_N,U(1)) = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

The first line comes from the formula $H^1(G,U(1)) = G$ for Abelian group G, while the second line is obtained from an explicit calculation of $H^2(Z_N,U(1))$ from Eq. (A6). The zeroth homology group is known to be given by

$$H_0(Z_N,\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}. \tag{B5}$$

Homology groups of the direct product $G = G_1 \times G_2$ of groups G_1 and G_2 can be computed with the use of the Künneth formula[55] that gives the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(G_1\times G_2,\mathbb{Z}) =& \bigoplus_i H_i(G_1,\mathbb{Z})\otimes H_{n-i}(G_2,\mathbb{Z}) \\ &\oplus \bigoplus_i \mathrm{Tor}[H_i(G_1,\mathbb{Z}), H_{n-i-1}(G_2,\mathbb{Z})]. \end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

Therefore, we can obtain the second homology group $H_2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1))$ from the homology groups of Z_N. Since the torsion functor vanishes ($\mathrm{Tor}[\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{Z}_N] = \mathrm{Tor}[\mathbb{Z}_N,\mathbb{Z}] = 0$) in Eq. (B6), we have

$$H_2(Z_N\times Z_N,\mathbb{Z}) = H_1(Z_N,\mathbb{Z})\otimes H_1(Z_N,\mathbb{Z}), \tag{B7}$$

and finally we obtain the second cohomology group of $G = Z_N\times Z_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1)) &= H_1(Z_N,U(1))\otimes H_1(Z_N,U(1)) \\ &= \mathbb{Z}_N\otimes\mathbb{Z}_N \\ &= \mathbb{Z}_N. \end{aligned} \tag{B8}$$

2. Non-trivial 2-cocycles of $H^2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1))$

The nontrivial cocycle of $H^2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_N$ is found from the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Hom}[H_1(Z_N,\mathbb{Z})\otimes H_1(Z_N,\mathbb{Z}),U(1)] \\ &\qquad\to H^2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1)). \end{aligned} \tag{B9}$$

Let us denote the group elements of $Z_N\times Z_N$ by

$$x^{n_1}y^{n_2} \qquad (n_1,n_2 = 0,\dots,N-1), \tag{B10a}$$

where x and y are generators of the first and the second $\mathbb{Z}_N$, respectively, satisfying

$$x^N = 1, \qquad y^N = 1. \tag{B10b}$$

We can define a set of 2-cocycles $\phi^2 = m\varphi$,

$$\phi^2 = m\varphi : (Z_N\times Z_N)^2 \to U(1) \tag{B11a}$$

for $m = 0,\dots,N-1$, where

$$m\varphi(x^{n_1}y^{n_2},x^{n_1'}y^{n_2'}) = n_1n_2'm\frac{2\pi}{N} \mod 2\pi. \tag{B11b}$$

We have constructed this 2-cocycle from the isomorphism in Eq. (B9) using the following sequence of mappings:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (Z_N\times Z_N)^2 & \to & Z_N\times Z_N & \to & Z_N & \to & U(1), \\ (x^{n_1}y^{n_2},x^{n_1'}y^{n_2'}) & \to & (x^{n_1},y^{n_2'}) & \to & n_1n_2' & \to & n_1n_2'm\dfrac{2\pi}{N}. \end{array} \tag{B12}$$

The functions $m\varphi$ clearly satisfy the 2-cocycle condition [Eq. (A7)] as

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta(m\varphi)(x^{n_1}y^{n_2},x^{n_1'}y^{n_2'},x^{n_1''}y^{n_2''}) \\ &= m\frac{2\pi}{N}[n_1'n_2'' - (n_1+n_1')n_2'' + n_1(n_2'+n_2'') - n_1n_2'] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{B13}$$

They are not 2-coboundaries [Eq. (A8)] except the one with $m = 0$, because they have the property $m\varphi(x,y) \neq m\varphi(y,x)$ for $m = 1,\dots,N-1$, whereas 2-coboundaries must satisfy the relation

$$\delta\phi^1(x,y) = \delta\phi^1(y,x). \tag{B14}$$

Thus $\phi^2 = m\varphi$ ($m = 0,\dots,N-1$) form an Abelian group $\mathbb{Z}_N$ with addition of functions and give nontrivial 2-cocycles for $m = 1,\dots,N-1$. Clearly, φ is a generator of the cohomology group $H^2(Z_N\times Z_N,U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_N$. In the case of $N = 3$, we have

$$\exp[i\varphi(x^{n_1}y^{n_2},x^{n_1'}y^{n_2'})] = \omega^{n_1n_2'} \tag{B15}$$

with $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/3)$. In particular,

$$\exp[i\varphi(x,y)] = \omega, \qquad \exp[i\varphi(y,x)] = 1. \tag{B16}$$

We can use elements of the second cohomology group $H^2(Z_3\times Z_3,U(1))$ to construct projective representations of $G = Z_3\times Z_3$. With the 2-cocycle $\phi^2 = \varphi$ we find from Eq. (12b) that generators U_x and U_y of a projective representation obey

$$U_xU_y = \omega U_yU_x \tag{B17}$$

and do not commute, as opposed to the elements x and y of the group $Z_3\times Z_3$.

Appendix C: SU(N) AKLT states and their transfer matrices

We show several properties of the transfer matrix $\mathcal{M}$ that are used in calculating correlation functions in Sec. III E. We consider the SU(N) AKLT wave function of the MPS form

$$|\Psi\rangle = C_N^{-1}\sum_{\{\sigma_i\}}\mathrm{tr}[A^{\sigma_1}A^{\sigma_2}\dots A^{\sigma_L}]|\sigma_1\sigma_2\dots\sigma_L\rangle, \tag{C1}$$

with

$$A^\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}}t^\sigma, \tag{C2}$$

where C_N is a normalization constant, σ_i labels states on each site in the adjoint ($\boldsymbol{N^2-1}$) representation, and t^a ($a = 1, \ldots, N^2-1$) are the su(N) generators in the fundamental representation. The su(N) generators t^a are traceless and hermitian $N \times N$ matrices that are normalized as

$$\mathrm{tr}(t^a t^b) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab} \tag{C3}$$

and obey the commutation relations

$$[t^a, t^b] = i f_{abc} t^c. \tag{C4}$$

Here the structure constants f_{abc} are totally antisymmetric, and summation over the repeated index c is assumed. The quadratic Casimir operator of su(N) operators T^a in the $\boldsymbol{d}$-dimensional representation is written as

$$\sum_{a=1}^{N^2-1} T^a T^a = C(\boldsymbol{d}) 1_d. \tag{C5}$$

For the fundamental representation ($T^a_{jk} = t^a_{jk}$) and the adjoint representation ($T^a_{jk} = -i f_{ajk}$), the eigenvalue of the quadratic Casimir operator reads

$$C(\boldsymbol{N}) = \frac{N^2-1}{2N}, \qquad C(\boldsymbol{N^2-1}) = N. \tag{C6}$$

In addition, we have a formula[42]

$$\mathrm{tr}(T^a T^b) = \frac{dC(\boldsymbol{d})}{N^2-1}\delta_{ab}. \tag{C7}$$

Next we define a transfer matrix for the SU(N) AKLT state as

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{m=1}^{N^2-1} A^m \otimes (A^m)^*, \tag{C8}$$

which is an $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix. The N^2-dimensional vector space is spanned by a basis $\{|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle\}$ with $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$, where $\{|i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the N-dimensional vector space. For two N^2-dimensional vectors

$$|u\rangle = \sum_{ij} u_{ij}|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle, \qquad |v\rangle = \sum_{ij} v_{ij}|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle, \tag{C9}$$

the inner product is written as

$$\langle u|v\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(u^\dagger v). \tag{C10}$$

With this basis, the action of the transfer matrix reads

$$\mathcal{M}|u\rangle = \sum_{m,i,j} [A^m u (A^m)^\dagger]_{ij}|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle. \tag{C11}$$

Now we show Eq. (70). This follows from the fact that an orthonormal basis of the N^2-dimensional vector space

$$|v_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle, \tag{C12}$$

$$|v_a\rangle = \sqrt{2}\sum_i t^a_{ij}|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle, \tag{C13}$$

is a set of all eigenvectors of the transfer matrix $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}|v_0\rangle = \frac{N^2-1}{N^2}|v_0\rangle, \quad \mathcal{M}|v_a\rangle = -\frac{1}{N^2}|v_a\rangle. \tag{C14}$$

This can be seen by using the following three equations:

$$\langle v_0|\mathcal{M}|v_0\rangle = \frac{2}{N^2}\sum_a \mathrm{tr}(t^a t^a) = \frac{N^2-1}{N^2}, \tag{C15}$$

$$\langle v_a|\mathcal{M}|v_0\rangle = \left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\sum_{a'} \mathrm{tr}(t^a t^{a'} t^{a'}) = 0, \tag{C16}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v_a|\mathcal{M}|v_b\rangle &= \frac{4}{N}\sum_c \mathrm{tr}(t^a t^c t^b t^c) \\ &= \frac{4}{N}\sum_c \left[\mathrm{tr}(t^a t^c t^c t^b) + \sum_d i f_{bcd}\mathrm{tr}(t^a t^c t^d)\right] \\ &= \frac{4}{N}\left[\frac{C(\boldsymbol{N})}{2}\delta_{ab} - \frac{1}{4}\sum_{c,d} f_{bcd} f_{cda}\right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{N^2}\delta_{ab}. \end{aligned} \tag{C17}$$

In the last equation, we have used Eq. (C7) for the adjoint representation in which $T^a_{bc} = -i f_{abc}$.

Finally, we show Eq. (73). In our basis, the action of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a$ reads

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a|u\rangle = \sum_{m,n,i,j} -i f_{amn}[A^n u (A^m)^\dagger]_{ij}|i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle. \tag{C18}$$

Then Eq. (73) follows as

$$\langle v_0|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a|v_0\rangle = -\frac{2i}{N^2}\sum_{m,n} f_{amn}\mathrm{tr}(t^n t^m) = 0, \tag{C19}$$

because f_{abc} is a totally antisymmetric tensor. In view of Eq. (70), this implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^a|v_0\rangle$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{M}$ with the eigenvalue $-1/N^2$.

[1] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Lett. **93A**, 464 (1983).
[2] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1153 (1983).
[3] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 799 (1987).
[4] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Commun. Math. Phys. **115**, 477 (1988).
[5] M. den Nijs and K. Rommelse, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 4709 (1989).
[6] T. Kennedy and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 304 (1992).
[7] T. Kennedy and H. Tasaki, Commun. Math. Phys. **147**, 431 (1992).
[8] F. Pollmann, A. M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 064439 (2010).
[9] A. M. Turner, F. Pollmann, and E. Berg, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 075102 (2011).
[10] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 075103 (2011).
[11] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 035107 (2011).
[12] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Science **338**, 1604 (2012).
[13] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 165139 (2011).
[14] M. Greiter, S. Rachel, and D. Schuricht, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 060401 (2007).
[15] M. Greiter and S. Rachel, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 184441 (2007).
[16] H. Katsura, T. Hirano, and V. E. Korepin, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **41**, 135304 (2008).
[17] K. Duivenvoorden and T. Quella, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 235142 (2012).
[18] K. Duivenvoorden and T. Quella, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 125145 (2013).
[19] H. Nonne, M. Moliner, S. Capponi, P. Lecheminant, and K. Totsuka, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **102**, 37008 (2013).
[20] K. Duivenvoorden and T. Quella, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125115 (2013).
[21] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992).
[22] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 10345 (1993).
[23] I. P. McCulloch, arXiv:0804.2509 [cond-mat.str-el].
[24] K. I. Kugel and D. I. Khomskii, Soviet Physics Uspekhi **25**, 231 (1982).
[25] D. Pérez-García, M. M. Wolf, M. Sanz, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 167202 (2008).
[26] H. Georgi, *Lie Algebras in Particle Physics* (Westview Press, Boulder, 1999).
[27] After completion of this manuscript, we became aware that H_N and ξ_N were reported in S. Rachel, D. Schuricht, B. Scharfenberger, R. Thomale, M. Greiter, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **200** 022049 (2010).
[28] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Europhys. Lett. **10**, 633 (1989).
[29] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Commun. Math. Phys. **144**, 443 (1992).
[30] A. Klümper, A. Schadschneider, and J. Zittartz, Europhys. Lett. **24**, 293 (1993).
[31] S. R. White and A. L. Chernyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 127004 (2007).
[32] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).
[33] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. , P06002 (2004).
[34] M. M. Wolf, G. Ortiz, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 110403 (2006).
[35] H. Ueda, I. Maruyama, and K. Okunishi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **80**, 023001 (2011).
[36] I. Affleck, Nuclear Physics B **265**, 409 (1986).
[37] I. Affleck and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 5291 (1987).
[38] F. C. Alcaraz and M. J. Martins, J. Phys. A **21**, L381 (1988).
[39] N. Andrei and H. Johannesson, Phys. Lett. A **104**, 370 (1984).
[40] M. Führinger, S. Rachel, R. Thomale, M. Greiter, and P. Schmitteckert, Annalen der Physik **17**, 922 (2008).
[41] I. Affleck, Nuclear Physics B **305**, 582 (1988).
[42] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal Field Theory* (Springer, New York, 1997).
[43] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010504 (2008).
[44] K. Hida, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 2207 (1992).
[45] A. Läuchli, F. Mila, and K. Penc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 087205 (2006).
[46] K. Penc and A. M. Läuchli, in *Introduction to Frustrated Magnetism* (Springer, 2011) pp. 331–362.
[47] M. N. Barber and M. T. Batchelor, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 4621 (1989).
[48] A. Klümper, Europhys. Lett. **9**, 815 (1989).
[49] Y. Xian, Phys. Lett. A **183**, 437 (1993).
[50] R. Lundgren, V. Chua, and G. A. Fiete, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 224422 (2012).
[51] Y. Q. Li, M. Ma, D. N. Shi, and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3527 (1998).
[52] Y. Yamashita, N. Shibata, and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 9114 (1998).
[53] J. J. García-Ripoll, M. A. Martin-Delgado, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 250405 (2004).
[54] Equation (A3) needs to be amended when antiunitary operators such as time-reversal transformation T are involved, because an operation of T changes the sign of $U(1)$ variable. In that case the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (A3) should be acted by g_1. However, we consider only unitary symmetries throughout this paper.
[55] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambrigde, 2002).
[56] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (2013).